DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 226 764 IR 050 315

AUTHOR	Sive, Mary Robinson
TITLE	School Library Media Centers and Networking.
INSTITUTION	ERIC Clearinghouse on Information Resources, Syracuse, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	IR-60
PUB DATE	82
CONTRACT	NIE-400-82-0001
NOTE	94p.; For related document, see ED 168 599.
AVAILABLE FROM	Information Resources Publications, 130 Huntington Hall, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13210 (IR-60).
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses - ERIC Information Analysis Products (071)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Information Networks; Information Services; *Interlibrary Loans; *Learning Resources Centers; *Library Cooperation; *Library Networks; *School Libraries; *Shared Services; State Programs

ABSTRACT

Taking as its point of departure the landmark paper, "The Role of the School Library Media Program in Networking," this study assesses the state of networking involving school libraries in mid-1982, with emphasis on operations of substantial significance to students and teachers and resource sharing. An analysis of the networking concept and definitions of the term are followed by a thorough overview for the uninitiated of the development of library networking in the United States, with particular attention to those involving school library media centers. Background pertinent to schools is then examined, including other such cooperative arrangements in the school environment, student use of public and other libraries, and theoretical justifications. Accounts of school library networking in 14 states are provided--Alaska, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Washington, and Wisconsin--and the final chapter summarizes the major themes that pervade the subject, formulates some tentative conclusions, and suggests topics in need of further investigation. An extensive bibliography is provided, and selected excerpts from state statutes, interlibrary loan policies, and other documents are appended. (BBM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED226764

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SCHOOL LIBRARY MEDIA CENTERS AND NETWORKING

by Mary Robinson Sive

ERIC Clearinghouse on Information Resources
Syracuse University
1982

IR050315

A former school and public librarian, Mary Robinson Sive is the author of the standard guide to multimedia selection tools, Selecting Instructional Media: A Guide to Audiovisual and Other Instructional Media Lists (3rd ed., Libraries Unlimited, 1983). Other recent books by her include Media Selection Handbook (Libraries Unlimited, 1983) and China: A Multimedia Guide (Neal-Schuman, 1982). Her column, "Media Monitor," appears in Curriculum Review and she serves on the Advisory Board of Curriculum Advisory Service.

This publication was prepared with funding from the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education under contract no. NIE-400-82-0001. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of NIE or ED.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The courtesies extended to the investigator by the following respondents are acknowledged with thanks:

Pauline Anderson, Library Director, Choate-Rosemary Hall, Wallingford, Connecticut.

Sandra Berry, Manager, Alaska Knowledge Base, Juneau.

Mary R. Boyvey, Texas Education Agency, Austin.

Elsie Brumback, Deputy Assistant State Superintendent, Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Betty J. Buckingham, Consultant, Educational Media, Department of Public Instruction, Des Moines, Iowa.

Heather Cameron, Head, Editorial Department, Libraries Unlimited, Littleton, Colorado.

Mardi Cole, Central Network of Inservice Resources (CNIR) Consultant, Marshalltown, Iowa.

John T. Corrigan, C.F.X., Editor, Catholic Library World, Haverford, Pennsylvania.

William T. Cound, Project Director, State Network, Colorado State Library, Denver.

Vergie F. Cox, Chief Consultant, Materials Review and Evaluation Center, Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Professor Carol Doll, College of Librarianship, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

Hugh Durbin, Director of Media Services, Columbus (Ohio) Public Schools.

Anne Marie Falsone, Assistant Commissioner, Office of Library Services, Colorado State Library, Denver.

Professor Herbert Goldhor, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of Illinois, Urbana.

Dr. Marilyn W. Greenberg, Coordinator, Library Services Credential Program, California State University, Los Angeles.

Dorothy A. Gregory, Consultant, Media Services, Maine State Library, Augusta.

Beatrice Griggs, Chief, Bureau of School Libraries, State Education Department, Albany, New York.

Dawn Heller, Media Services Coordinator, Riverside-Brookfield Township High School, Riverside, Illinois.

George Katagiri, Coordinator, Educational Technology, Department of Education, Salem, Oregon.

Audrey Kolb, Northern Region Coordinator, Alaska State Library, Fairbanks.

Marjorie W. Lindsey, Consultant for Multitype Library Cooperation, State Library, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Eugene Lynch, Library Media Center, East Lyme High School, East Lyme, Connecticut.

Patricia Mautino, Director, Curriculum Resources Center, Oswego County Board of Cooperative Educational Services, Mexico, New York.

Dr. Robert H. Miller, Supervisor, Educational Media, Department of Education, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Barbara B. Minor, Publications Coordinator, ERIC Clearinghouse on Information Resources, Syracuse, New York.

Paula Montgomery, Chief, School Media Services Branch, Department of Education, Baltimore, Maryland.

Nancy Motomatsu, Supervisor of School Media Centers, Department of Public Instruction, Olympia, Washington.

Joan Roeder, Director, Central Processing Center and District Libraries, East Peoria, Illinois.

Richard J. Sorensen, Instructional Media Programs Supervisor, Department of Public Instruction, Madison, Wisconsin.

Jane Williams, Assistant State Librarian, Department of Cultural Resources, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Anne Voss, Coordinator, School and College Media Services, State Library, Trenton, New Jersey.

Dr. Thomas Walker, Director of Media Services, Howard County Public Schools, Ellicott City, Maryland.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Scope 2

Methodology 4

Definitions 6

Library Networking in the United States 10

Public Library Systems 10

National Efforts 11

Multiple Library Systems 11

Task Force on the School Library Media Program 12

White House Conference on Library and Information Services 14

Since the White House Conference 15

Revisionism 15

Networks and Cooperative Endeavors in Schools 17

Schools and Public Libraries 18

Uniqueness of School Library Collections 20

School Libraries and Networking in Selected States 22

Alaska 22

Colorado 23

Connecticut 23

Florida 25

Illinois 25

Indiana 27

Iowa 27

Maryland 28
Minnesota 29
New Jersey 30
New York 30
North Carolina 31
Washington 32
Wisconsin 32

Conclusions 34
Data 34
School Librarians' Professional Status 35
Telephone 36
Library Users 37
Interlibrary Loans 37
Student Access to Other Libraries 38
Public Access to School Library Media Centers 39
Readers' Guidance 40
Collection Development 41
Cost 41
Program Emphasis 42
Governing Structures 42

Bibliography 43

Appendix A. Colorado Interlibrary Loan Code 1971/1972 61

Appendix B. Connecticut: General Statutes 11-9a 67

Appendix C. Illinois Statutes. 81 Sec. 121 68

Appendix D. Interlibrary Loan Code for Illinois 69

Appendix E. Iowa. Governor's Conference on Library and Information Services, 1979. Resolutions 74

Conclusion: Everyone Needs Three Libraries 75

Appendix F. Minnesota Multi-county Multi-type Library Systems Recommended Planning Policies and Principles 77

Appendix G. New York. Broome-Delaware-Tioga BOCES School Library System Interlibrary Loan Policy 79

Oswego County School Interlibrary Loan Policies 82

Appendix H. North Carolina. Governor's Conference on Library and Information Services. Resolutions 84

Appendix I. Texas. Education Code Sec. 11.33 85

INTRODUCTION

School libraries are the unseen majority. Consult the Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information to find out how many libraries there are in the United States, and the answer is 29,000 public, academic, and special libraries (1982, pp. 314-315). School libraries are not mentioned. In truth, there are over 100,000 libraries in the country, and two-thirds of them are school libraries. In 1978, the last year for which data are available, there were 70,000 library media centers in public schools (Heintze, 1981). To those must be added an unknown number in private, parochial, and independent institutions.

In the past ten years, thousands of American libraries have established electronic connections through computer terminals or entered into other arrangements for sharing services. Each institution remains independent, but is tied through these linkages into a greater universe of resources, data, and expertise. Through such networking even the smallest facility can potentially bring the services of the entire information community to its clientele. Hundreds of school library media centers are members of such networks. This, too, is not widely known.

This study will focus on the status of school library participation in networking.

The amount of printed matter devoted to discussion of library networking is truly staggering, and the number of hours spent on deliberations at workshops, conferences, and conventions equally so. Though there is a standard definition for networking (see below, p. 3), the term can apply to a variety of activities, and usage is somewhat free-ranging.

If there is lack of precision among professionals, it can be surmised how much less clear the term must be to the public. In a service organization, the ultimate test of any administrative scheme must be improved service to the user or, alternatively, the same service as before at lower cost. Library networking, to be significant, must benefit library users.

For this reason, this study, which assesses the state of networking involving school libraries in mid-1982, concerns itself only with operations of substantial significance to students and teachers, and disregards networks solely in support of technical services.

The parameters of this study allowed only cursory review, and, because the response to requests for information was uneven, the information supplied here is by no means balanced. However, enough information was obtained to permit some generalizations and to point the direction for future studies.

Scope

After an analysis of the networking concept and definitions of the term, this paper presents a thorough overview, for the uninitiated, of the development of library networking organizations in the United States, with particular attention to those involving school library media centers. This is followed by an examination of background pertinent to schools, such as other cooperative arrangements in the school environment, student use of public and other libraries, theoretical justifications, and others. There then follow accounts of school library networking in several states to the extent that this can be ascertained from the existing literature. The final chapter summarizes the major themes that pervade the subject, formulates some tentative conclusions, and suggests topics in need of further investigation. An extensive bibliography presents the available literature from the mid-1970s on. An appendix reprints selected excerpts from statutes, interlibrary loan policies, and other documents.

This study takes as its point of departure the landmark paper, The Role of the School Library Media Program in Networking (1978). This position paper prepared for the National Commission on Library and Information Services (NCLIS) "review(ed) the state of networking in school library media programs nationwide" and made detailed recommendations aimed at making school library media programs part of a "National Network of Libraries and Information Services" (National Commission on Library and Information Services, 1978, p. 62). It is further discussed below (pp. 12-13).

The NCLIS definition of a network as "a formal arrangement whereby materials, information and services provided by a variety of types of libraries and/or other organizations are made available to all potential users" is used, but limited, as has been stated, to operations of substantial significance to end users, be they students, teachers, or administrators in schools.

Operations have significance if they match the reader with the desired reading matter or information. The needed document may be brought to the user through interlibrary loan, or the person may be given a free pass opening up admittance to other collections where a search may be carried on. The librarian at the "home" library may help to identify the needed information carriers and direct the inquirer to known sources of known documents. There may also be direct delivery of the information sought, as when abstracts and document copies are obtained from remote databases. The latter occurs most frequently in the school environment in the case of ERIC searches performed for staff members.

Operations significant to library users may also consist of bibliographic access through a union catalog listing holdings of local libraries, of special purpose collections such as cooperative film libraries or book and media examination centers, of shared facilities, or other, more limited, services.

Close reading of flyers and news releases from cooperative organizations reveals that the term "networking" is sometimes applied to nothing more than publication of a newsletter or an understanding to consult on cooperative collection development. Under the NCLIS definition, such agreement must be in the form of a legally binding contract to deserve the appellation "network."

Networking solely in support of technical services is a needed precursor, and a union catalog a necessity, before resources can be shared effectively, but a union catalog alone is not networking within the purview of this study. Similarly, although networking is heavily dependent on automation, for the purposes of this study, automation alone is not networking. Staff and collection development are important activities and can be strongly aided by consultant services available through library systems and networks, but, again, their effect on the user is indirect and sometimes much delayed.

Combined facilities for school and public libraries have been studied exhaustively elsewhere (Aaron, 1980; Woolard, 1980). Special purpose dissemination networks and other structures designed to advance specific curricula or subjects, e.g., women's studies, career education, bilingual education, ethnic heritage programs, and the like, generally are created outside the school library media center and bypass it.

School library networking is also receiving attention in Canada (see "Network Development," 1982; "Networking," 1979); in Australia (see Broadbent, 1980a); and perhaps elsewhere, but our concern here is with the situation in the United States only.

Resource sharing is the form in which library networking can assume the greatest degree of reality for library users. Free interlibrary loan is a service that has long been available to a limited extent to public library users. It grew rapidly once small libraries joined together into library systems and regional reference centers were established in many states beginning in the 1960s.

This study of school library networking paid particular attention to resource sharing and attempted to find specific instances where:

(1) students and school staff could obtain free interlibrary loan of materials from other school libraries in the same or other districts or from non-school libraries either in the same locality or elsewhere;

(2) students could gain open access to nearby public and/or academic libraries; and

(3) staff could gain free access to information held in electronic databases, especially ERIC.

Methodology

This report is based on data derived from published and unpublished sources, and from personal communications with individuals involved in school library networking, as well as others.

a. Published Sources

A search of the ERIC database, conducted by the ERIC Clearinghouse for Information Resources in June 1982, yielded 181 references to journal articles and ERIC documents, many dating to the 1960s. Search terms employed included Elementary Education, Secondary Education, School Districts, Library Networks, Library Cooperation, Learning Resources Centers, Media Specialists, Consortia, Shared Services, Cooperative Programs, Resource Sharing, Library Media Center, Resource Center, and Network, in appropriate Boolean combinations. Manual searches were conducted in Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, Dissertation Abstracts International, and Library Literature. Official reports were obtained through personal contacts in several states, and a set of three microfiche containing documents finally came to hand in the last week of preparation (Sorensen, 1982).

The networking literature is long on exhortation and praise but short on evaluation. Papers and articles that describe existing operations more often are "how we did it" accounts rather than critical assessment. Such assessments must, first of all, define all terms, especially that catch-all, "networking." Stevens (1980a) identifies 14 different aspects of networking, from "grassroots approach" to "internationalism," not all of them applicable to a particular operation. Few of the published contributions to the literature offer that level of analysis.

b. Unpublished Documents

The investigator obtained official reports, flyers, news releases, and similar sources and leads through personal contacts by mail, telephone, and at conventions. Figures quoted in the pages that follow derive largely from such reports.

c. Personal Communications

Letters went to approximately 75 persons who had served on the NCLIS Task Force on the Role of the School Library Media Program in Networking (see pp. 12-13), written about the subject or completed dissertations on this or related topics, and others who have responsibilities extending to school libraries with either state education departments or networking organizations. A particular effort was made to contact individuals who could throw light on participation by private and religious schools, and building and

district level personnel involved in networking. Since the time frame for the study coincided in large part with the summer vacation period, the last-mentioned was largely unsuccessful.

The initial mailing resulted in a lively correspondence and many telephone conversations with a "network" of interested, helpful, and committed professionals, whose names are listed, with appreciation, on pages i to iii. The data and documents which furnished the raw materials for this study were, to a large extent, assembled in this fashion.

The period allotted for completion of the study did not permit the generation of data specifically designed for its purposes. This investigator had to rely on already existing statistics, which turned out to be scanty, indeed. Nor was there the opportunity to follow up non-respondents. This resulted in the regrettable absence of reports from some states where school libraries have been in multi-type networks long enough to make their experience potentially the most instructive.

Definitions: Evolution of the Networking Concept in Librarianship

The Oxford English Dictionary documents early nineteenth century uses by Coleridge and Emerson of "network" in the sense of "an interconnected chain or system of immaterial things." But the term has made its way into the vernacular more recently as computers have made their way into daily life. A computer network is "a complex consisting of two or more interconnected computing units" and in teleprocessing, "network" describes "a number of communication lines connecting a computer with remoter terminals" (Glossary of Computer Terms, 1981). Webster's New International Dictionary Second Edition (1959) offers only the literal meanings of the term, but Webster's Third New International Dictionary (1961) adds a third meaning, "an inter-connected or interrelayed chain, group, or system," the definition still given in the Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (1981). The Random House Dictionary of the English Language (1969) definition is "any widespread, highly organized system or activity." The colloquial use referring to a "network" of people has apparently not yet made its way into dictionaries.

The definition offered in the Annual Review of Information Science and Technology (ARIST), on the occasion of the term's first appearance in its pages, is "an interconnection of things, systems, or organizations" (v. 3, 1968, p. 289). The following year's volume relates information networks to "communication channels. . . geographically arranged in networks" (v. 4, 1969, p. 340). Usage of the term is traced to a 1965 article in Science, where it was employed to refer to a network of citations of scientific papers.

The 1969 Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information refers to a network as "a system of libraries" or "a cooperating group of independent libraries" (p. 80). The 1970 edition further refines the term to signify "an organization that includes communication facilities to link its parts" (Bowker Annual, 1970, p. 29).

"System," it seems, almost inevitably becomes part of almost all definitions of "network."

Library networks were numerous enough by the mid-1970s to be categorized according to:

- signals carried (digital, video, analog, communications);
- logical structure (centralized or star, decentralized, distributive, hierarchical);
- institutional focus (public library, academic library, special library, intertype);
- function (cataloging, bibliographic, interlibrary loan, reference information);
- subject (medical information, agricultural information, energy information);
- equipment (teletype, telephone, radio, television, computer);
- geographic area (statewide, regional, multi-state, national, international). (Becker, 1979, cited in DeJohn, 1980, p. 635)

What is called "institutional focus" here is today more often termed "single type" versus "multi-type;" e.g., examination centers and film libraries may be regarded as "single type," "single function" networks.

"Networks" was added to the ERIC Thesaurus of Descriptors in mid-1966 with the meaning "a series of points interconnected by communication channels." "Information networks" and "library networks," each progressively narrower terms, joined the list in early 1969. The former is defined as "information systems linked for information exchange through formal communications," the latter as "formal associations of two or more libraries, established to increase resources, improve services, and reduce costs."

"In the library field, the term has been used as a catchall for a broad range of cooperative activities," was the comment at a 1978 networking conference (Markuson, 1980, p. 4). The following year the National Commission on Library and Information Services (NCLIS) established a definition (see page 3) which may be considered definitive. Yet, new ones are still being offered, such as "an organization of member libraries that have joined together to facilitate access to a bibliographic utility and to develop mutually beneficial services and products, such as regional union lists of serials" (Martin, 1982, p. 80).

The proliferation of the term through the literature of the library and information professions is easily documented. The 1967-69 volume of the indexing journal Library Literature is the first to display entries under the term "Networks of Libraries," showing three columns of such entries. The 1970-73 volumes average one and a half to one and three quarters columns per year, the next six years average three and a half columns each, and in 1980 coverage jumped to five columns.

The first colume of the Annual Review of Information Science and Technology (1966) has no entry in its subject index for "network," but in the very next issue there is a discussion of "National Information Networks," followed by similarly titled essays in volumes 3 and 4 (1968 and 1969). Volumes 5 and 6 feature sections on "Library Automation," each including a briefer one on "Networks and Multilibrary Systems." Separate chapters on "Library and Information Networks" appear in volumes 7 (1972) and 9 (1974). Volume 12's "Computer Communication Networks" focuses on network technology. In Volume 13, "Library Resource Sharing Through Networks" reviews the 1974-77 literature, with an update under "Library Networks" for the years 1978-80 in volume 16 (1981).

Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information first mentioned "networks" in the 1969 volume, but did not index under that term until the following year when regular surveys of networking began. They have appeared annually since, with the exception of one or two years. The index for 1972 distinguished "information networks" from "library networks," but the survey article covered both aspects.

The definition proposed by the National Commission on Library and Information Services, however, may be considered the definitive definition at this time, and it was used as the working definition for this study.

LIBRARY NETWORKING IN THE UNITED STATES

The long history of interlibrary cooperation is a factor frequently mentioned as responsible for the network movement (e.g., Stevens, 1980a). Others are the introduction of automation and resulting advances in information retrieval. Commentators agree that it was the development of machine readable cataloging (MARC) at the Library of Congress (LC) in the late 1960s that triggered library networking (Evans, 1979; Stevens, 1980b). Much of it was funded by the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) of 1966.

Resource sharing and interlibrary loan had been common aims of early cooperative ventures, but it was only the advent of the computer that made practical the creation of union catalogs, the indispensable first step toward effective sharing. As independent libraries entered into formal, legally binding agreements to share bibliographic data, they went from cooperation to networking.

Public Library Systems

Library systems may conveniently be classified into four major categories: single jurisdiction, multiple jurisdiction, cooperative systems, and statewide hierarchical systems (McClarren, 1970, pp. 237-39). Single jurisdiction city or county libraries consisting of a main library and branches were the first library systems and date back to the very early days of public libraries. Multiple jurisdiction systems whose members are independent units, each responsible to its own governing board, began in the late 1950s pursuant to state legislation authorizing the establishment of such systems and, in some cases, offering state aid for the purpose. By the late 1960s, the most populous states had functioning library systems well in place. These typically maintained manually compiled union catalogs, provided consultant services, and were the conduits for processing interlibrary loans within the system and beyond it to regional reference centers, the state library, and other institutions. Other services included central back-up collections, film libraries, and delivery services. The term "networking" began to become popular as a synonym for "system," and networking was on the program of the 1969 American Library Association (ALA) convention.

National Efforts

A 1970 Airlie House Conference on Goals for Library Cooperation and Networking, jointly called by ALA and the United States Office of Education (USOE), has been said to mark the beginning of true networking. The National Commission on Library and Information Science was its immediate outgrowth. In the same year, OCLC, the initials then standing for Ohio Colleges Library Center, began operations as a computerized catalog network, going online in August 1971 with 100,000 records (Evans, 1979, p. 12). Though it began as a cooperative effort of college libraries, OCLC's membership is now only 50 percent academic libraries, and enough school libraries are members for a School Library Users Group to be in formation.

Much of the work of the National Commission was directed at advancing the concept of a national information network, a vast system designed to deliver quality information services to all, independent of the local resources available. Its position paper relative to school libraries (Franckowiak, 1974) pointed out the advantages of participation in a national network. A lone voice found the emphasis on a national bibliographic network misplaced, asserting that direct federal aid to local districts would accomplish more (Grazier, 1974, p. 330). The networking concept found its way into the school library standards jointly promulgated by the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) and the American Association of School Librarians (AASL) (American Association of School Librarians, 1975). The NCLIS draft program (National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, 1975) embodied the national network concept, and the Network Advisory Committee, composed of representatives of major network organizations, soon issued its report firmly entrenching the concept (Avram, 1977).

Multiple Library Systems

Meanwhile, back in the states, school libraries were joining library systems. Indiana's Area Library Service Authorities, established pursuant to 1967 legislation, had been the first multi-type systems. In 1975, Illinois school libraries were invited to affiliate membership in the state's public library systems, the Washington Library Network (WLN) went online (Evans, 1979, p. 12), the Colorado state network was established with school libraries as full voting members (Dyer, 1979, p. 457), Southern California school libraries participated in interlibrary loan systems, and some Wisconsin school

libraries were part of that state's multi-type networks under the state's Public School Libraries Access Program (Wisconsin Library Bulletin, 1975).

Task Force on the Role of the School Library Media Program

In January 1977 directors of AASL prevailed upon NCLIS to appoint a 21-member Task Force on the Role of the School Library Media Program in the National Program, which, in turn, commissioned two position papers. Loertscher (1977) addressed himself to the issues of the need for networking and the potential mutual benefits, as well as the counter-indications. Johnson and Hines (1977) surveyed existing cooperative schemes to the extent that they were reported in the literature, finding generally self-described operations of various extents in twelve states. Objectives of networking, its pros and cons, feasibility and barriers, possible structures, and other aspects were noted.

The report of the Task Force was published in 1978 (National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, 1978). It based its call for school library inclusion in a national information network on the universal right of equal access to information that had been articulated by NCLIS some years earlier (National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, 1975). The contention was that, if children and young people were to enjoy such free and open access, it had to be through their school libraries. The Task Force's own rationale for including school library media centers in networking was stated as follows:

> In summary, the information needs of students, teachers, and others involved in elementary and secondary education frequently go beyond the resources that even the very best school library media programs are able to make available. Schools need to provide quick and efficient access for their users to the materials and services of other libraries. On the other hand, school library media programs are collectively rich in specialized resources that have value not only for school related users but for the many individuals who use or might use public, academic, and special libraries. Full participation by schools in library networks would provide ready access to a wider range of resources and would enable other libraries to take advantage of the school's specialized materials and services to the benefit of millions of others. (p. 11)

Among the unique resources school libraries could contribute, according to the Task Force, were such special school-related materials as audiovisual resources, teachers' professional literature, high interest/low reading level collections, curricular materials, and collections for special education. Schools and districts could offer public, academic, and special libraries various supporting services, examination facilities, instructional materials production, computer facilities, and human resources. In some cases, the school media center may be the only library in a community. In return, networking would "improve the educational opportunities for young people by expanding significantly the range of resources to which faculty and students have access" (National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, p. 62), and would relieve media specialists of tedious clerical duties.

The Task Force found that the problems attending accomplishment of its aims were many, involving psychological, political, and legal factors, funding, communication, and planning. It identified the organizations and governmental agencies whose actions were required to implement each of the 41 immediate and intermediate recommendations, specifying needed organizational structures, legislation, data, funding, and other actions.

The notion of free and equal access did not gain universal acceptance. One commentator termed it "populist," asserting that:

> This advocacy of universal access is a political device designed to ensure the widest possible support for the network concept and, thus, adequate financial support by governmental units, which are sensitive to this populist sense of equality. One of the major complaints about networks, perhaps to some degree well-founded, has been that they are not designed for the small library and the average user. (Stevens, 1980a, p. 40)

But in the same year in which that statement was made, there was sufficient support for the network concept for private foundations and the National Endowment for the Humanities to grant $5 million toward launching a Bibliographic Development Program by the Council on Library Resources (Avram, 1981, p. 47). In that year, too, the New York legislature authorized establishment of school library systems linking the facilities of several districts and, in turn, establishing linkages with public library systems and other networks (see pp. 31-32 and Appendix G).

White House Conference on Library and Information Services

The Governor's Conferences on Library and Information Services which met during 1978 and 1979 preparatory to the White House Conference in November of the latter year were more restrained in their resolutions than had been the Task Force. Many simply urged cooperation between school and public libraries and, in some cases, academic libraries. Illinois issued a specific call for "full access to materials" (Markuson, 1980, p. 389). North Carolina resolved "that interlibrary loan is a basic service in all libraries and should be available to every citizen in the State, and that more expeditious delivery alternatives and coordination of services among regional, county... and school libraries be explored" (Access to information..., 1981, p. 14). Iowa delegates endorsed "state legislation and funding to enable school libraries... to establish a network system for sharing among the member units and to interface with the regional public library system..." (Markuson, 1980, pp. 389-390; see also Appendix E).

The goals and objectives of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services echoed earlier NCLIS publications by postulating a "right of equal access to all publicly held information for all citizens" (A-5) and recommending "the planning and development of multi-type library and information networks... to include plans for a national periodicals system and the concept of a national lending library for print and nonprint materials" (C-2). Federal and state funding was called for to achieve implementation. Its recommendation for school libraries resolved that "school and public library boards and administrators should establish policies for cooperation," that "school library and public library staff should specify procedures and implement programs for cooperation," and that "school library and public library staff should specify procedures and implement programs for cooperation" (C-3), in addition to recommendations intended to strengthen individual school libraries.

The White House Conference's powers were advisory only; implementation, if it was to occur, had to come through the actions of governing boards of thousands of independent public library districts, school districts, and other institutions. The powers of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science are also limited. With a budget of $700,000 and a staff of nine (Bearman, 1981) it serves as a clearinghouse and connecting link, a voice in Washington, and a source of ideas.

Since the White House Conference

A negative economic climate and efforts at all levels of government to reduce expenditures have made the years since the White House Conference an inopportune time for the institution of new programs which of necessity cost more money. The time has not been propitious for implementing the recommendations of the School Library Task Force. To do so would not be an easy task, in any case, in our decentralized educational system comprising 83,000 public school buildings (Heintze, 1981, p. 43) and unknown thousands of parochial, private, and other independent schools.

Legislation to authorize regional library networks has passed in several states in recent years; in others such legislation was being prepared for introduction or being debated; in yet others union catalogs were being compiled (Trezza, 1981, pp. 208-210). Though at least one commentator observed that "the debate on the national network has... more than a touch of unreality about it" (Gorman, 1980), to be able to plug into such a network remained the expressed hope of many librarians in public and private schools (e.g., Anderson, 1980, p. 17).

What has in fact evolved is a pattern of state and regional networks. The 1982 American Library Directory lists over 300 "networks, consortia and other cooperative library organizations," and a 1980 government directory profiled 608 "library networks and cooperative library organizations" (Eckard, 1980). Most of them are connected to and purvey the service of one of the national bibliographic utilities. The largest of these, OCLC, contains some 9 million records, Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN) 5 million, and Washington Library Network (WLN) close to 3 million. Albeit in the private sector, OCLC is the de facto national network; indeed, its operations are international.

Revisionism

The year 1980 saw the first article in a large-circulation professional journal that questioned the value of a national network (Malinconico, 1980). Of more relevance to the focus of the present study is a more recent contribution to the same journal (Ballard, 1982). Analyzing data from three states (California, Illinois, and New York), the author finds interlibrary loan accounting for from 0.17 percent to 2.6 percent of the total circulation in California libraries in 1978-79, a fraction of one percent in one Illinois system in 1979,

and slightly over 2 percent in a New York multi-type system somewhat earlier. He is thoroughly sceptical:

> Resource sharing is a return to closed stacks with the added disadvantages of less certainty of delivery and a longer period of wait. Our patrons have historically disliked this arrangement and they are now used to better. It's scarcely surprising, therefore, that they make little use of the opportunities offered by networking. (p. 682)

Concern about the costs of networking, questions whether some of the moneys involved could be more profitably spent elsewhere, and calls for cost studies are being encountered with some frequency and often come from university library directors (e.g., DeGennaro, 1981; Veaner, 1982).

Networking literature offers "little in the way of solid evidence of the kinds and levels of benefits received from (resource sharing)" (Palmour, 1978, p. 168). That library cooperation, and now networking, are "good things" has always been a tenet of faith with librarians and, as such, has lacked both a firm theoretical base and the exacting scrutiny of cost/benefit analysis.

NETWORKS AND COOPERATIVE ENDEAVORS IN SCHOOLS

Special purpose networks are a popular device with educators who resort to them when they wish to implement a new curricular emphasis. The U.S. Department (formerly Office) of Education and the National Institute of Education have at various times established dissemination networks--the National Diffusion Network, Women's Educational Equity Network, and others--making inter-school networking a well-established tradition.

Other cooperative arrangements are time-honored practices in the educational system. About the same time that public library systems were coming into being (see p. 10 above), states authorized the organization of regional educational service centers to effect cooperative educational efforts among independent school districts. By the 1960s, many states had such agencies which covered the entire state and had as their mission special education, vocational education, audiovisual production, inservice training, or other specialized areas of the curriculum or of supporting services. Regional resources centers to back up district collections of professional and other materials and regional film libraries are common.

Schools thus are used to purchasing filmstrips, cassettes and other "building level" materials themselves, and looking to district or regional centers for loans of 16mm films. The transaction, however, often is directly between classroom teacher and film library, thus bypassing the school media center. Film lending services serve students and teachers on an order of magnitude quite in excess of any as yet accomplished by school library networking. Texas' 20 Regional Media Centers accounted for over 2 million shipments of 16mm films in 1980-81, those in Iowa for over 900,000.

School staff in many states are given the opportunity to request free searches of the ERIC database. For example, Alaska reports 600 such searches in one year and Kentucky over 1,100, plus the provision of 500 to 600 free microfiche duplicates per month. State education agencies frequently provide free or low-cost videotapes of instructional television programs to state schools; Maine, e.g., reports sending out approximately 4,000 such program copies in 1981-82.

None of these popular programs directly involve school media centers. Efforts to create a nationwide system of regional Educational Media Selection Centers originated within the publishing and library realms in the early 1970s, but were aborted due to lack of funding. Pennsylvania, Maryland, Indiana, North Carolina, Illinois, and Wisconsin are among the states that maintain either statewide or regional examination centers; those in Illinois serve both public and school libraries (Barkman, 1978). A voluntary effort at cooperative evaluation of audiovisual media by school media specialists from several districts, the Bay Area Media Evaluation Guild, marketed its evaluations nationally to great acclaim but ceased functioning after several years.

Schools and Public Libraries

Before there were school libraries of significance, students used public libraries for their extended reading and research needs. They still do, even in communities with excellent school media centers, for reasons that are social as much as anything else. Keeping high school libraries open in the late afternoon and evening has been talked about but rarely implemented; few communities would willingly assume this expense when there is a public library available and open during those hours.

A study of actual usage patterns conducted at 15 high schools (two of them private schools) revealed that students use an average of three libraries in preparing reports and papers--or two, if "the home library" is excluded. Only 14 percent restricted their searches to a single facility (Drott, 1980; also Mancall, 1980). (These findings, incidentally, illustrate considerable resourcefulness on the part of these students who, without "skills" instruction, apparently managed to cope adequately with the Library of Congress classification they must have encountered at academic libraries). Students, apparently, are quite adept at resource sharing, though the study found they sometimes overlooked resources in their school libraries.

Institutional cooperation is another matter, however. A 1972 dissertation study of 24 communities in Indiana found that "little communication exists between the public librarians and the elementary schools in those cities surveyed.... Planning for programs is not a shared activity between school and public librarians" (Woolls, 1973). Another investigator characterized what she found in 1975 as "a case study in institutional rigidity and vested interest" (Dyer, 1978).

Restrictions are placed in many states on interlibrary loan availability to school libraries and to young people, although the Model Interlibrary Loan Code for Regional, State, Local or Other Special Groups of Libraries adopted by ALA in 1980 urges that "any member of the borrowing library's clientele should be eligible" (American Library Association, 1981).

A 1977-78 study found 73 percent of the responding public libraries permitting interlibrary loans (ILLs) for children, with limitations. A parent or teacher may, of course, intercede where the youngster is precluded from the direct transaction (Miller, 1981). In one state where school libraries may borrow from the state library (Maine), school loans accounted for 30 percent of the total.

After surveying the literature of school-public library cooperation, Professor Shirley Aaron concluded that "until librarians in both institutions have addressed the problems (of human and institutional barriers to cooperation) adequately, it will be very difficult to offer children and young people the quality and types of library services they require to meet their educational and personal needs" (Aaron, 1980, p. 26).

Even in the best of times, a media center in a school building cannot possibly provide materials to support every conceivable instructional and extracurricular need that may arise. School media resources have always been supplemented from outside sources, be it a teacher visiting a nearby college library for professional resources or a student stopping at the local or nearby public library. Networking arguably is but the process of institutionalizing such methods and making them more efficient. An editorial in Library Journal, on the occasion of New York state's funding several pilot school library systems, warned the profession that "if school and public librarians don't get together and begin to develop combinations for their services, the citizens and politicians will do it for them" (Berry, 1979).

Uniqueness of School Library Collections

While students and teachers have access to both school and public--and even academic--libraries, school collections are effectively closed to the public. Yet, research studies point to the unique resources found in school media centers that networking can make available to those outside, and those studies counted only books, excluding audiovisual materials (Altman, 1972; Doll, 1982; Markuson, 1977). The Task Force papers underscored media centers' potential contributions (National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, 1978, pp. 17-18). School libraries contain fine collections of children's and young people's literature, their staffs possess advanced knowledge of audiovisual equipment, its selection and purchasing; they are experienced in audiovisual cataloging, handling and production; and many schools have quite advanced computer facilities. Moreover, in rural areas the media specialist may be the only professionally trained librarian (Falsone, 1977). The latter point is also emphasized by another writer (Dyer, 1979). No studies came to the attention of this investigator that addressed to what extent school collections are being used by outsiders in those schools that are members of networks and have been for several years.

In the 1970s and the years since, enrollments have declined, school buildings have been closed, and cost-conscious administrators have eliminated professional school library positions. In the 1960s school libraries had ridden the crest of the baby boom generation moving through the public schools, and reaped the benefits of generous National Defense Education Act (NDEA) and Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) funding.

To many, networking seems the answer in the face of declining local, state, and federal support. A former president of AASL (Baker, 1981) presented this point of view: "Cooperative relationships and linkages... could sustain excellence in programs and inspire others to seek after it.... The failure to establish such resource sharing networks effectively during the past twenty years haunts the profession during these difficult times."

The "absence of organized sharing among schools" (Miller, 1981, p. 42) remains the pattern. In all too many cases, each building level facility remains a universe of its own, even in districts supporting

centralized processing. At the most, there is sharing of collections within a school district, often in large blocks in support of curriculum rather than in response to individual requests for specific titles. In all too many cases, elementary school A still resorts to informal means to learn whether school B in the same district and but three miles away owns a given title and will lend it. Listings of competencies required of school media specialists make no mention of the knowledge and skills required to participate in networking, and only a few texts for media center operation make reference to such skills (e.g., Chernik, 1982).

Whether resource sharing does make for a better return on the public investment in public and school libraries, and whether it makes for better school library media programs or higher achievement scores, are all open questions which we are not likely to have answered very soon.

In the meantime, the distinguished panel of library and information professionals that formulated A Library and Information Science Research Agenda for the 1980s (Cuadra et al., 1982) has given its nod to a proposed study of an online network to support question answering in libraries--a giant step beyond the bibliographic online networking that is still beyond reach for most school libraries.

SCHOOL LIBRARIES AND NETWORKING IN SELECTED STATES

It has been said that federalism affords the opportunity for social experimentation on a small scale and for learning from such experiments before adopting a course for the nation as a whole. Such learning can only take place, however, if policymakers know of one another's experiences. It is hoped that the accounts in the pages that follow and the documents in the Appendix may play a part in that process, and that some lessons may be distilled from them. They describe a variety of structures and mechanisms, all aimed at the common goal of enhancing information access for schools, and report the very few statistics that are available.

What constitutes significant data for the evaluation of libraries and their services is a matter for continuing debate in the profession. The extreme variety of records that are kept in various jurisdictions should make clear the need for agreement on and standardization of tools for measurement.

The reports on various states are in alphabetical order and describe patterns evolved in each for information networks serving students and staff. Mention of a particular operation in a particular state does not signify its absence elsewhere.

Alaska

All libraries in the state with appropriate readers may obtain free copies of the COM (computer output microform) Alaska Library Network Catalog, which is based on the Washington Library Network (WLN) database and includes school district holdings, including those of the Anchorage School District. Interlibrary loan (ILL) is provided at no charge throughout the state. Eight of the approximately 80 libraries represented in the COM Alaska Union List of Serials are school libraries, the remainder being public, academic, special, and government libraries. Distribution of the catalog is free, and so is ILL of periodical articles.

The Alaska Knowledge Base System provides instructional support to staff in schools and districts throughout the state, including some 600 free ERIC searches in one year.

Colorado

Enabling legislation for the creation of Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) was enacted in 1965, and seventeen such boards now encompass all but a few of the state's 181 school districts or 423 buildings. Film lending services extend to private as well as to public schools and some BOCES operate book and media examination centers.

A 1975 law authorized the establishment of regional multi-type library service systems open to all publicly supported libraries. All public libraries belong to the seven systems, which have been in place since 1976, as do 158 school districts; this number, however, excludes three of the largest school districts. As full-fledged members, school libraries are represented on governing boards.

Systems are supported by state moneys, and libraries that are "net lenders" are nominally reimbursed by the state. School libraries, almost without exception, are net borrowers in the interlibrary loan operations of the various systems.

A microfiche state union catalog, which contains an estimated 1.2 million titles and over 2 million holdings, is revised annually and distributed free to system members.

An investigation conducted throughout the state in 1978-79 concluded that "the actual experience of the participants in Colorado demonstrated the ability of a multitype library network to successfully include schools." The sense of professional isolation decreased, and recipients, on the whole, received their interlibrary loan requests in sufficient time (Immroth, 1980).

Reports for 13 of the 16 school districts in one of the seven regional library service systems indicate a total of approximately 700 ILL transactions for the period July through December 1981. Of these, 146 were "lent," primarily to other school libraries, and 542 "borrowed," generally from public libraries and major resource centers (see also Appendix A).

Connecticut

Public and private schools may be members of Connecticut's six regional Cooperating Library Service Units (CLSUs), pursuant to 1975 legislation (see Appendix B). Approximately 110 out of an estimated

total of 1,300 schools were members in 1979 (Association of Specialized. . . , 1980). They, like other member libraries, pay a membership fee and may be represented on governing boards.

CLSUs arrange for interlibrary loans, operate a delivery system, supply printouts of OCLC catalog records, and provide location information, among other services. Regional offices, which are partially funded by the state, have found the cost of ILL to average $2.79 per request, $5.24 per request filled through other systems. Libraries also arrange directly with one another for ILLs after obtaining location information through the system. The extent of this is not known.

A study conducted by a high school librarian surveyed 34 secondary school media centers in southeastern Connecticut in 1981, obtaining returns from 22. Availability of the delivery system, Connecticar, proved to be strongly correlated with the level of a school's cooperative efforts, with schools receiving direct delivery achieving the highest level, those obtaining indirect delivery through a public library or district media center scoring next, and those without delivery systems scoring lowest. An equally determining factor was the presence of a telephone in the media center. This was found to be true of only 53 percent of the senior high and 40 percent of the junior high schools. Schools having both a telephone in the media center and direct delivery to the schools made a total of 46 ILL requests during 1980 (Lynch, 1981, 1982). (The system reported 3,449 ILLs in the ten months of the 1981-82 academic year.)

A 1978 survey of two eastern Connecticut counties with 98 public, parochial, and private schools serving 47,000 students in K-12 found 2 of the 34 responding school libraries open to full public use and 11 open to limited public use, divided almost equally between elementary and secondary facilities (Bob, 1978).

The state's many independent schools are joined in an association which, among other services, arranges for informal sharing of microforms. At least one residential independent school--Choate-Rosemary Hall in Wallingford--offers DIALOG search services to both its students and the public, and places its DIALOG terminal in the local public library during the summer vacation period. Its own library reported 47 incoming and 19 outgoing interlibrary loan transactions during 1981-82. Transactions with the local public library are not included in these figures, according to Director Pauline Anderson (personal communication, 9/27/82).

Florida

Schools are among the 530 members of the Florida Library Information Network, begun in 1968. Among ILL transactions including schools, one percent involved lending by the schools, almost none to other types of libraries. Academic libraries accounted for 44 percent of the network's ILLs (Linsley, 1982).

Illinois

The Illinois Library and Information Network (ILLINET) was authorized by legislation passed in 1965. The law establishing state-funded library systems makes no mention of school libraries, but does list among its objectives to "provide library materials for student needs at every educational level" (113. Sec. 3b). Efforts are under way to open up membership to all libraries. In the meantime, school libraries may become affiliated by invitation and through special agreement with a library system. As affiliate members, representatives of school libraries are prohibited from serving on system governing boards. Participating libraries are under statutory obligation not to reduce the level of funding of their own operations. (Sec. 121, see Appendix C). The Interlibrary Loan Code for Illinois governs (see Appendix D).

Systems maintain union catalogs (generally not directly accessible to users) and delivery services, and there is also an Intersystem Delivery Service.

Public and private school libraries were invited to participate in the systems beginning in 1975 and many have done so. There were 103 school members of ILLINET reported in the first year (DeJohn and Lamont, 1975), and 218 individual schools and school districts were members by September 1976 (Drescher, 1976). In 1979, 629 of the network's 1,029 members were school libraries or districts (Illinois Libraries, December 1979) and in 1981, 968 out of 1,576 (Illinois Libraries, December 1981). The state's total number of schools was estimated as 4,000 in 1979 (Association of Specialized . . . , 1980).

The State Board of Education's Media Resources Center is also affiliated with ILLINET (Ford, 1982, p. 321).

A University of Illinois Graduate School of Library and Information Science survey of 493 public school districts, conducted for the

State Library, revealed their pattern of system usage in 1980-81. Interlibrary loan was used by 218 school districts and reference services by 155. Smaller numbers were involved in other services. In excess of 90 percent of those reporting also reported satisfaction levels of 4 and 5, on a scale of 1 to 5, with ILL and reference service.

One of the 18 systems, the Illinois Valley Library System, counts 16 school libraries among its 73 members and provides interlibrary loan, back-up reference, and delivery services, among others. A three-year, $520,000 LSCA-funded experimental project giving small and medium-sized libraries in this system online access to OCLC included four school libraries, all of whom decided to continue OCLC after the project ended. The four placed 505 ILL requests through OCLC in 1981-82, whereas the number in 1980 had been 210 (Bills, 1982, p. 32). Studies in progress indicate that OCLC improves the elapsed time for a limited number of searches (Bills, personal communication, 9/15/82). Preliminary results of an attitude survey indicate agreement by library users that automation makes it easier to find out what is in the collection of other libraries as well as one's own library, and that interlibrary loan operations should not be limited to libraries in the state.

In the Suburban Library System, the Suburban Audio-Visual Service extended film rental to three area high schools on an experimental basis. It was found that, rather than causing an additional strain on titles already in heavy demand such as feature films and children's films, school requests contributed to more intensive use of less popular portions of the film collection, and the additional circulation, via a co-op through a member school, resulted in impressive usage statistics and more efficient use of existing funds. There is no mention of reciprocal services rendered by the schools to the system or its members.

The experience of one high school that is a member of the Suburban System indicates that most of its ILL requests are filled within the system. Delivery is made to the local public library, and the total volume of ILL for a student body of some 1,300 students is in the neighborhood of 100 to 150 titles per year (Heller, personal communication, 9/24/82).

Lack of professionally qualified staff is seen as the major impediment to networking in Illinois school libraries by one observer (Roeder, personal communication, 10/19/82).

Indiana

In 1979, Indiana's nine Area Library Service Authorities (ALSAs) served 180 schools out of the state's total of 2,124 public and 556 private schools (Association for Specialized. . . , 1980). They received reference and ILL service, including out-of-state loans and photocopies of requested articles (Catt, 1980). There were 18 school members in the Indiana Cooperative Library Services Authority (INCOLSA)--a technical services network--in 1978 (Baker, 1980).

Iowa

The mandate of the state's 16 Area Education Agencies (AEAs) is to "furnish educational services and programs. . . to the pupils enrolled in public or nonpublic schools. . . . The AEA Board shall provide. . . for media services for the local school districts. . . . (It) shall not establish programs and services which duplicate programs and services which are or may be provided by the area schools. . ." (Sec. 273.2). Media centers, which "shall contain. . . a materials lending library, . . . a professional library, (and) a curriculum laboratory. . ." are among other specified components (Sec. 273.6).

Funding formulas for AEAs and AEA Media Centers are specified by law. State appropriations for 1982-83 were budgeted at $10,500,000.

Total holdings in November 1981 were close to 1 million items, consisting of 656,000 books (242,000 separate titles), 91,000 films (66,000 titles), 11,000 filmstrips, 11,000 video recordings, 15,000 kits, and smaller numbers of various other formats, including almost 900 periodicals subscriptions.

State required statistics record both circulation figures and those for "turn downs." The counts for 1980-81 were 909,000 16mm films or 1.55 per student (90,000 turn downs); 975,000 books or 1.66 per student (42,000 turn downs); 108,000 other media (9,000 turn downs); and 46,000 professional resources in various formats (1,000 turn downs). These figures reflect some block sharing of books and sets of materials. Circulation figures for films show a steady increase each year for the six years from 1975-76 on, but for books and other media 1977-78 represented a high point, with the three subsequent years showing a decline. The percentage accounted for by 16mm films increased from 18 percent in 1975-76 to 46 percent in 1980-81, and film library services are considered the most successful

aspect of AEA Media Centers, with production services next (Buckingham, personal communication, 8/27/82).

Delivery services provided by AEA's added up to over 1,000,000 miles in 1980-81, at a cost of $735,000, or $1.18 per student.

Media centers maintain catalogs of their own collections only, but no union catalogs for participating schools. A multi-type network designed to effect resource sharing, IowaNET, is in the developmental phase, but the Educational Media Consultant for the state is not on its planning committee.

The Central Network of Inservice Resources (CINR), a second-level, inter-system network funded by participating AEAs and the state, supplies over 4,000 films, videotapes, and other audiovisual materials for teacher inservice use to schools through AEA Media Centers.

Since 1971, the Iowa Network for Obtaining Resource Materials for Schools (INFORMS) has provided online searches on ERIC and other databases for teachers at public and approved nonpublic schools. AEAMCs arrange for the searches and obtain abstracts, microfiche, and other copies of documents and articles, and citations.

A joint publication of the Department of Public Instruction and the State Library Commission, Distinctive Functions of School Media Centers and Public Libraries (Buckingham and Porter, 1981) urges "an overall community wide program of library development" jointly formulated by school and public librarians, and strongly recommends against combined facilities. Its conclusion, "Everyone Needs Three Libraries," is quoted in Appendix E.

Maryland

School libraries are eligible to participate in the Maryland Interlibrary Loan Organization (MILO) and need not be lenders. The eight of the state's 24 school systems which were users in fiscal year 1982 accounted for 11 percent of MILO transactions, at a fill rate of over 80 percent. Microfiche union catalogs, which include some district professional collections, are available for student use and no fees are charged (Montgomery, personal communication, 9/14/82).

In 1981/82, four school systems submitted 4,538 requests which were filled at the rate of 82 percent (Montgomery memo, 10/29/82).

A study of one school system's participation disclosed a total of 703 MILO requests in one year, 78 percent of them filled and 84 percent or more arriving in time. Central office personnel were the heaviest users in relation to their number, followed by teachers and students. Professional staff requested periodicals more often than did students, whose requests generally were for monographs. The total cost for one year was $12,000 (Walker, 1982).

In 1979, 17 of the 24 public library systems reported cooperating with schools in film service, 13 in interlibrary loan, and 9 in delivery service, according to a state education department release.

The State Media Services Center is the "central depository of teacher-oriented materials available to all educators in the state." In 1978, it served over 14,000 individuals with more than 26,000 print and audiovisual items and more than 1,600 ERIC searches (Maryland State Department of Education, 1978).

Project LIFE (Library Information Functional Exchange) offers educators extended resource services, including DIALOG and BRS searches, and access to other resources.

Montgomery County has provided online retrieval for employees since 1973 and permitted public library and community college use of its terminal. ERIC searches performed amounted to 250 in 1971, 430 in 1972 (Dowling and Kirsch, 1977), and there were 1,876 online searches performed in 1977 (Fite, 1978).

Minnesota

The state legislature created seven multitype library systems in 1979 (see planning policies in Appendix F), and provided an initial appropriation of $365,000. Members of governing boards serve as individuals rather than as representatives of member libraries, but school library media centers are represented along with other libraries on an advisory committee for each system. In July 1981, 201 school districts and private schools were members out of the state's total of approximately 1,509 public and 475 private schools (Association for Specialized. . . , 1980).

The Central Minnesota Libraries Exchange in its April 1982 newsletter reports that the bulk of interlibrary loan requests, includ-

ing subject requests and telephone reference queries, come from schools.

A statement on "Public Library/School Media Center Relationships" adopted by the State Board of Education in 1979 comes out strongly in favor of separate facilities but sharing of resources, including interlibrary loan, delivery, reciprocal borrowing privileges, coordination of hours of operation, and many others (Public Library. . . , 1980).

New Jersey

School libraries are eligible for interlibrary loan from the State Library's collection of 40,000 juvenile volumes, its audiovisual collection, five regional film centers, and 17 county Audiovisual Aids Commissions holding close to 50,000 films.

New York

Legislation to include school library media centers in library networks was passed in late 1978, and provides for a unique, hierarchical scheme whereby systems consisting of school libraries only are, in turn, linked into multi-type inter-system structures, all state-funded. To launch the program, the state education department selected several pilot projects for initial three-year funding, which was later extended for a fourth year.

Five elements of network development were identified early on: locator files or union catalogs, communication and delivery, and agreements to govern sharing of resources, reimbursement, and coordinated collection development (New York Education Department, 1980, p. 10).

Twelve school library systems began operations in 1979, seven of them as parts of two regional intersystem networks in two metropolitan areas, the other five in unaffiliated systems coterminous with existing Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) or, in one case, a city school disrict.

The development of union lists and of sharing mechanisms were the chief conditions placed upon grant recipients, and $185,000 was appropriated in 1981 to fund the development of union catalogs in 19 remaining BOCES and city school districts.

Expenditures of the 12 pilot projects totaled $621,000 in 1979-80 (New York Education Department, 1980, p. 81) and $569,000 in 1980-81, of which salaries accounted for 69 percent (1981, pp. 68,70). Combined budgets for 1981-82 were $754,000. In June 1981, the 12 systems comprised 149 public school districts representing 656 buildings with libraries, approximately one quarter of the state's districts. There were also 50 nonpublic schools, for a total enrollment of 407,000 students (New York Education Department, 1981, pp. 60-70).

Interlibrary loan transactions for resources in all formats went from under 13,000 in the first year of operation to over 24,000 in 1980-81, or 1 per 17 students (New York Education Department, 1981, p. 62). The 1981-82 figure is approximately 33,000 (Griggs, personal communication, 9/30/82). The uniform experience has been that around 90 percent of requests are filled from other school libraries.

Installing telephones in school libraries was an early objective, but schools with telephones remained in the minority in 1981 (New York Education Department, 1981, p. 69).

Summer loan of popular materials from school libraries to public libraries is reported by one inter-type system, and 602 database searches were conducted in 1980-81 (New York Education Department, 1981, p. 64).

Thirty-two independent schools in New York City have for a number of years maintained the Independent School Multimedia Center, primarily a film rental library.

North Carolina

Three agencies of the Department of Public Instruction provide cooperative services to school libraries: the Education Information Center, the Film Computerized Catalog Service, and the Materials Review and Evaluation Center.

One of the stronger of such services among the states, the Materials Review and Evaluation Center assists educators in identifying curriculum-related print and nonprint media by a review and evaluation process, the distribution of annual bibliographies, and maintenance of an examination collection. Recent materials are sought from several hundred vendors.

The Education Information Center offers reference and research services for educators from its collection of journals, books, ERIC documents, and other materials.

School libraries are excluded from the State Union Catalog.

The absence of telephones in many school media centers presents a drawback to informal, low-cost networking, further compounded by the presence in the state of many independent telephone companies (Access to Information. . . , 1981, pp. 6, 36).

Both the Director of the Materials Review and Evaluation Center and the Consultant to the Department of Public Instruction's Division of Educational Media serve as members of an ad hoc committee on multi-type library cooperation.

Washington

Seventy schools out of the state's estimated 1,970 public and 236 private institutions were members of and served by seven Library Service Areas in 1979 (Association for Specialized. . . , 1980).

Wisconsin

It is the policy of the State Department of Public Instruction, adopted in 1979, that "the resources in instructional media programs are shared among all schools within a district, between districts, and with public, academic and special libraries" (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 1979, p. 1).

The state is covered by 15 public library systems established under 1971 legislative authorization, 13 non-statutory multi-type library councils, and 19 Cooperative Educational Service Agencies. Efforts are under way at present to give official status to multi-type networks. Of the 372 school districts, 227 (61 percent) are members of multi-type library cooperative organizations.

The Wisconsin Library Service Record, an annual publication, lists the state's academic, special, and public libraries, but not its school libraries.

A 1979 interlibrary loan study analyzed a sample of 1,879 transactions involving 26 Wisconsin libraries, six of which were school

libraries. The school libraries' 104 requests were filled at a rate of 78 percent, primarily from academic and public libraries; only 21 percent of the transactions were with other school libraries. This is one of the few studies to estimate ILL costs, which were here found to amount to $3.38 per request (Ryan, 1980).

A more recent report indicates that from 75 percent to 82 percent of all schools borrow from non-school libraries; 82 percent also lend to other libraries in their districts. The actual numbers of transactions involved are not recorded. "Borrowing from other schools in the district takes place in 54 percent of the school districts either occasionally or frequently," elementary schools doing so at higher rates. "High schools lead in borrowing from other kinds of libraries. . . . The least common borrowing pattern is 'from schools in other districts'" (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 1982, p. 10).

A statewide online bibliographic database of approximately 2 million titles is in preparation and will be capable of being accessed via popular microcomputer models.

CONCLUSIONS

Data

The most striking concusion to be drawn from this survey is that what the NCLIS Task Force found in 1977 is still true in 1982: "(1) There is a paucity of published information concerning school libraries and networking, and (2) for those programs that are described in printed sources, the available data lack completeness and/or comparability" (Johnson and Hines, 1977, Preface).

That statistics are collected differently from state to state and from system to system, as true here as it is in the case of other public concerns, is the price we pay for the diversity we cherish. Few entities collect and publish the entire range of data the researcher would wish for. The following are suggested as a minimum:

- number of schools participating in resource sharing;
- number of interlibrary loan transactions, how many of them occurred between schools in the same district, between schools across district lines, from local or nearby public and academic libraries to schools and vice versa, and from distant public and academic libraries to schools and vice versa;
- union catalogs and other tools for location information, their scope and availability to end users, and number of location calls;
- public access to school libraries;
- cost of resource sharing and of individual ILL transactions;
- source(s) of funding;
- number of school libraries with/without telephones;
- delivery method for ILL;

- representation of school library media centers on governing boards.

Illinois and Minnesota are among the very few states that publish system annual reports or other news in their statewide library publications.

In some states school libraries have been members of multi-type networks for up to seven years. Though much of this has been limited to only cataloging or centralized processing, such sharing of technical services soon creates a demand for sharing of others. Data and longtitudinal analyses documenting the experiences of these schools would be extremely instructive. We do not even know the number of schools in such networks nationwide for each of these seven years. The experience of at least some of these schools may have been long enough to permit conclusions as to the measured or perceived impact of library networking on students and staff.

With hard data so difficult to come by, it is no wonder that much writing on the topic is polemical and sentimental rather than factual. The scarcity of data has not gone unnoticed; e.g., "There is a real need for good, practical evaluation in the field" (Palmour, 1978, p. 168); and "Concrete evidence of the actual advantages and disadvantages for school library media specialists who participate in a multi-type library network has not been collected and disseminated" (Immroth, 1980).

School Librarians' Professional Status

The invisibility of school libraries was noted at the beginning of this report. One consults the American Library Directory, whose records furnish the figures in the Bowker Annual of Library and Book Book Information, to find out about a community's libraries. There one finds, for each city, town and village, information on public, academic, corporate, hospital, and other libraries down to rural libraries with annual total budgets of $5,000--but not one school library, public or private.

Interestingly, back in 1973, four school districts and a county wide public district in Minnesota were reported as having embarked on cooperative ventures, prominent among them the publication of an integrated staff directory (Van Orsdel, 1975). This is something that, unlike many other professions, librarianship still does not have

nationally and that is still difficult to come by on a local, regional, or state-wide basis.

Advocates of networking are unanimous in their praises of the benefits of "personal networking," i.e., the interchange with professional colleagues, "bringing school librarians into the professional community" and overcoming their parochialism. Clearly, such allegations are not susceptible to close measurement, but the benefits may be very real nonetheless.

The absence of communication between school and pubic librarians in the same community is a recurring refrain in the literature (e.g., Barron, 1980, p. 627). Those who abhor the high costs of library networks may say that it should be possible to achieve professional integration at somewhat lower cost.

School librarians often feel invisible to their adminstrators as well. Many perceive the increased stature of the school's library, which it gains by being in the same information network as large academic and public libraries, as valuable within the school environment.

Closely related to this issue is the matter of school library staffing. The network environment can offer support for non-professionals who staff media centers. While networking has increased the number of professional positions in some areas, there are reports from others that OCLC cataloging is being used as justification for replacing professionals with clerical staff.

Telephone

Not only are school librarians often not seen, many of them are not heard either. In vast numbers, they lack a tool of modern communication that one thought was everywhere--the lowly telephone. Among the achievements of New York's pilot projects has been the installation of telephones in many school libraries. In North Carolina, the absence of telephones stands in the way of plans for effective networking. A Connecticut study finds a direct relationship between the presence of a telephone and the level of interlibrary loan transactions.

It is not a high-tech fix that school librarians need to ease their sense of isolation--a simple telephone extension would be quite

appropriate technology. It should not require a consultant's recommendation to achieve this.

Library Users

Woolls (1980) pointed to the need to ascertain the views of librarians in the field, not just those at system headquarters, to learn how networking was faring. These individuals, presumably, also are in closer touch with the needs and demands of library users. The information needs of both the librarian and the clientele served in school library media centers are little researched and vastly unknown.

Interlibrary Loans

Depending on the point of view, the number of ILL transactions--to the extent the numbers are known--is considered too small or too large. Critics dismiss the operation as insignificant because such transactions only amount to a fraction of one percent or a small percentage of total circulation (Ballard, 1982). On the other hand, the fear has also been expressed that interlibrary loan requests will increase so much as networking spreads that libraries will have to place greater restrictions on their holdings and turn down requests more often. Such restrictions may be based on format (microforms, audiovisual materials), on availability status (in print, out-of-print), on user status (children vs. adults), or on intended use (reference books vs. popular materials). Libraries certainly do not want to ship valuable items, but neither does it make sense to send out a paperback at a cost three times its retail value. Interlibrary loan codes (for examples see Appendixes A and D) leave such matters up to the discretion of the lending institution, but a study of actual practices in selected libraries could be quite informative.

Interlibrary loan transactions, though few, can be highly significant to the recipient. To what extent this is true, is another unkown. Some documents may be delivered too late, may be the wrong edition, or otherwise not be responsive to users' needs. Statistics are needed on how satisfactory transactions are to the requesters.

Interlibrary loans requested by schools certainly need to be analyzed and their volume and character related to curriculum, total circulation, and cost.

School library media centers can to a large extent predict areas of demand that are curriculum related. It may be practical to shift

entire collections in anticipation of such demand rather than to process numerous individual ILL requests. But the issue of depriving another library's primary clientele must also be addressed.

Available data suggest that most school library ILL transactions are between schools, rather than school libraries calling on the resources of other types of libraries, and that more transactions go to schools than are sent from schools. Resource sharing patterns in large districts, particularly city and county school districts that provide centralized processing services, would be highly instructive and could provide models. Such districts do not necessarily have a union catalog or even a union shelf list, however.

The importance of introducing high school students to information sources wider than those of the high school library and to the library community at large is often stressed as an argument in favor of networking:

> The future users and producers of information in our country are enrolled in our elementary and secondary schools right now. They are forming attitudes not about information, but about how available it is and about how able they are to get at it. They are forming attitudes about the role of libraries in this information world and in the organization of information in our society. (Sorensen, 1980)

Even one successful interlibrary loan that provided just what was needed in time for the completion of an assigned paper could certainly have a ripple effect in making students better library users. On-site access to nearby public and academic libraries would be another method.

Student Access to Other Libraries

Ideally, networking gives students and teachers more effective access to resources outside schools' own collections and enhances the efficiency of student use of public libraries. Through the bibliographic network, the "home library" can locate the wanted document and pass this information on to the person seeking it. With free access, the user then goes to the library in question, which may have been asked to place a "hold" or "reserve" on the book (or record or pamphlet). Clearly, this is the only way resource sharing of non-circulating materials can be effective. Depending on the distance

and accessibility by transportation involved, the user may find this method quicker or otherwise more attractive.

Whether this "increases" usage of libraries other than the "home library" is an interesting point. The question is difficult to answer since library "use" itself is not a well-defined term. If it is measured in time spent in the library, "use" may even decrease as the visitor strides purposefully to the circulation desk where the copy is being held or to another known location of a known document.

One recent study found that "low use (of a school library) is not simply a reflection of lack of holdings. . . . Instruction and guidance from the teacher and librarian are more important than holdings" (Drott, 1980, p. 25). Public librarians need to be aware of this and not assume that school library resources have been exhausted by the student coming in for help. If both institutions have ready access to records of each other's collections, in whatever form, each can give better service. Such networking could go a long way toward teaching students the use and breadth of the information services available through libraries.

Use of collections othen than one's "home library" as a method of resource sharing is less susceptible to measurement than are interlibrary loans, the number of calls to a system union catalog to obtain location information can provide some indication of the extent of its use.

Public Access to School Library Media Centers

That school libraries have unique collections has been established by researchers (e.g., Altman, 1972; Doll, 1982), who concluded that resource sharing was indeed indicated since there was less collection overlap than conventional wisdom may have surmised. Those studies confined themselves to books only. The degree of overlap would be even less, it may be assumed, were audiovisual materials included in the count.

Though proponents of school participation in library networking extol the contributions to be made by school media centers, interlibrary loan transactions from schools to other types of libraries are still comparatively rare. The result of truly opening up school library collections to the public by direct on-site access and by interlibrary loan and full representation in bibliographic networks will be interesting to see. One hopes that citizens, given an opportunity to take

advantage of school libraries' unique resources, may become more willing to support them. Having a contribution to make to the larger community may indeed give media specialists added stature both in the community and in the school. The result could well be the changes in attitude that usually accompany achievement and recognition, and increases in both visibility and credibility for the media center.

School libraries open to the public are a rarity, except in the case of combined facilities, though a Connecticut survey found a number of schools stating that the public could use them on a "limited" basis (Bob, 1978). No record was found of school libraries being open even to their own students during vacation periods, though this is a frequently expressed wish.

Readers' Guidance

The "single most compelling reason for including school libraries in national biblographic systems and interlibrary loan arrangements... is that the school librarian may be the only convenient access point for a given individual into an organized collection of knowledge and the guidance and expertise of an information specialist" (Dyer, 1979, p. 461). School librarians, ideally, are best trained and most experienced in dealing with students' information needs and questions. They are best equipped to conduct the "reference interview" and help the student identify needed sources. If the sources can then be delivered to the school--or the student directed to them at another library within reach--there is no need for a second reference interview. This advantage must be assumed to exist, particulary where the school media specialist is professionally trained and the public library staff is not. It is not known in how many communities this is true, or in how many others the reverse may be the case. Few school librarians are trained in electronic database use, however, and it has been pointed out that such lack of training severely restricts the value of staff in small library facilities as intermediaries (Lynch, 1976, p. 199). On the other hand, not many school-related information questions really need such depth, and ERIC searches are now being handled for school staff without the intercession of the school librarian/media specialist.

A survey of rural bookmobile services found that many rural public schools do not have school libraries, and that, as a result, 54

percent of the clientele were youngsters, and two-thirds of the bookmobiles served schools directly (McCallan, 1980).

Collection Development

Interlibrary loan without cooperative collection development is not enough because, without such agreements, a given document may not be purchased at all and thus not be available anywhere for interlibrary loan (Battin, 1980). This caveat applies not only to the research libraries to whom it was addressed, but to institutions of more modest aspirations as well. It is necessary in any community to make certain that either the public or the school library keeps back issues of popular periodicals in hard copy; else neither may keep it, each assuming the other does, or both may keep only microfilm copies. For school information purposes this is no petty matter.

Such agreements are undoubtedly in existence in many places on an informal basis. Whether more networking will lead to more cooperation in collection building remains to be seen.

Cost

That the financial aspect of networking is taken up as one of the last items in this analysis is no reflection on its importance. It may, in fact, be the overriding issue.

Costs can be readily measured and, unfortunately, they are quite high. No one has attempted to arrive at cost/benefit ratios. The question may well be asked whether the public funds now allocated to networking will level out at an acceptable plateau, and whether alternative uses for the money may not achieve a higher degree of information delivery to end users.

Networking has been heavily dependent on federal and foundation funding, and on state appropriations in amounts that local governments will never be ready to assume as real property tax burdens. Nor will potential users willingly bear the cost of such transactions. It also involves unrecorded costs in the form of staff time in member libraries, though testimony varies on this point and the process may save as much time as it adds.

The real cost of interlibrary loan has been estimated at as high as $15 per transaction. If private information brokers can supply copies of articles at half that cost and still make a profit, it is only

because they make extensive use of "free" public libraries which thus, in effect, subsidize private business. A dilemma arises for libraries when they can get less expensive service from information brokers than from their own system or network headquarters. Permitting user access to a wider range of libraries in effect shifts some of the cost of resource sharing to the user in a manner that may be quite acceptable.

Certainly, the benefits of networking and resource sharing must be weighed against the cost. To arrive at any meaningful cost/benefit ratio will clearly require far more systematic collection of data than is being done at present.

Program Emphasis

"Overcataloging," if it indeed results from bibliographic networking as charged (DeGennaro, 1981), is not only costly but is an activity of little, if any, service to the reader. The establishment of bibliographic networks had to receive emphasis during the start-up years. More direct user services will need to be stressed in the future. End users (students and teachers) and intermediaries at points of service (media specialists) will have to be heard from in order to determine directions for school media centers' networking.

Governing Structures

Whether hierarchical inter-system networks on the New York model are to be preferred to multi-type systems on the Colorado model is of great significance to states that have yet to determine their future course with regard to school library linkages. It is a question that can only be answered after thorough analysis of both objective data and subjective testimonials of users. Those data are not available at this time.

This concluding chapter ends, as it began, with a call for complete and comparable data on the aspects of school library networking that are highlighted in this study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aaron, Shirley L. School/public library cooperation: A state of the art review. Syracuse, NY: ERIC Clearinghouse on Information Resources, Syracuse University, 1980. 37pp. ED 192 810.

Aaron, Shirley L. School/public library cooperation--the way it is. Catholic Library World, 1981, 52(7), 280-285.

Aaron, Shirley L. A study of combined school-public libraries. Chicago: American Library Association, 1980. 107pp.

Access to information for North Carolinians: Multitype library cooperation working paper no. 1. Raleigh, NC: Department of Cultural Resources, State Library, 1981.

ALA yearbook. Chicago: American Library Association, 1976-1982.

Alaska. Department of Education. Office of Educational Technology and Telecommunications. Educational telecommunications for Alaska. Vols. I-IV. Juneau, AK: State Department of Education, 1982. ED 217 890-893.

Altman, Ellen. Implications of title diversity and collection overlap for interlibrary loan among secondary schools. Library Quarterly, 1972, 42(4), 177-194.

American Association of School Librarians. Media programs: District and school. Chicago, IL: American Library Association; Washington, DC: Association for Educational Communications and Technology, 1975.

American Library Association. National interlibrary loan code, 1980. In American Library Directory (34th ed.). New York: R. R. Bowker, 1981, pp. 1737-1738.

Amey, L. J. (Ed.). The Canadian school-housed public library. Halifax, NS: School of Library Service, Dalhousie University, 1979.

Anderson, Pauline H. The library in the independent school. Boston, MA: National Association of Independent Schools, 1980. 59pp. ED 191 469.

Anderson, Pauline H. What's going on in independent schools? School Library Journal, 1979, 26(3), 33-37.

Annual review of information science and technology, Vols. 1-16. White Plains, NY: Knowledge Industry Publications for the American Society for Information Science, 1966-1981.

Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library Agencies. The report on library cooperation (3rd ed.). Chicago: American Library Association, 1980. 500pp.

Avram, Henriette D. Library networking in the United States, 1980. In Bowker annual of library and trade book information, pp. 46-51. New York: R. R. Bowker, Inc., 1981.

Avram, Henriette D. and Maruyama, Leonore S. (Eds.). Toward a national library and information service network: The library bibliographic component. Washington, DC: Library of Congress, Network Advisory Group, 1977. 54pp. ED 142 222.

Baker, D. Philip. School and public library programs and information dissemination. School Media Quarterly, 1977, 5(2), 119-127.

Baker, D. Philip. School libraries and media programs. ALA yearbook, 1981, 262-266; 1982, 250-255.

Baker, Harold. Indiana school library media centers and their participation in network programs. Indiana Media Journal, 1980, 2(2), 25-29.

Ballard, Tom. Public library networking: Neat, plausible, wrong. Library Journal, 1982, 107(8), 679-683.

Bard, Therese and Sakai, Edith. School Libraries. In Miles M. Jackson (Ed.), International handbook of contemporary developments in librarianship, pp. 546-557. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1981.

Barkman, Donna. Report on the study of cooperative materials examination centers for Wisconsin (Bull. No. 8181). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin, School of Education, 1978. 102pp.

Barron, Daniel and Curran, Charles. Assessing the information needs of rural people. The development of an action strategy for rural librarians. Library Trends, 1980, 28(4), 619-631.

Battin, Patricia. Research libraries in the network environment: The case for cooperation. Journal of Academic Librarianship, 1980, 6(2), 68-73; reprinted in Library literature 11: The best of 1980, pp. 3-14. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1981.

Bearman, Toni Carbo. NCLIS in the eighties: The changing role of the federal government in U.S. information activities. Paper presented at the midyear conference of the American Society for Information Science, May 1981. 10pp. ED 213 422.

Bender, David R. Networking and school library media programs. School Library Journal, 1979, 26(3), 29-32.

Berry, John. School/public library service (editorial). Library Journal, 1979, 104(9), 989.

Bibliographic networks. ALA world encyclopedia of library and information services, pp. 80-83. Chicago, IL: American Library Association, 1980.

Bills, Linda G. OCLC experimental project description. Peoria, IL: Illinois Valley Library System, 1982. 39pp.

Bob, Murray L., White, Harrison and White, Patricia. Regional intertype library cooperation in Windham and Tolland Counties, Connecticut. Willimantis, CT: Eastern Connecticut Library Association, 1978. 295pp. ED 168 466.

Booth, Barry E. Network nodes. Illinois Libraries, 1973, 55(5).

Bowker annual of library and book trade information, passim. New York: R. R. Bowker, 1969-1982.

Brandehoff, S. E. Network (column). American Libraries, passim.

Broadbent, Marianne (Ed.). Sharing today's resources--meeting tomorrow's needs. Sydney, N.S.W.: Library Association of Australia, 1980a. 152pp. ED 212 260.

Broadbent, Marianne et al. Technology, systems and school librarians: An approach to continuing education. Unpublished paper, 1980b. 15pp. ED 210 015.

Brown, David J. Electronic document delivery systems. In May Katzen (Ed.), Multi-media communications, pp. 68-87, at 70. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1982.

Buckingham, Betty Jo and Porter, Barry L. Distinctive functions of school media centers and public libraries (2nd ed.). Des Moines, IA: Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, 1981. 10pp. Included in ED 208 854.

Butler, Brett. State of the nation in networking. In Bowker annual of library and book trade information, pp. 94-112. New York: R. R. Bowker, 1976.

Catt, Martha. Hoosier school libraries are playing the cooperation game. Indiana Media Journal, 1980, 2(2), 14-15.

Center for Governmental Research, Inc. Rochester Area Resource Exchange: Evaluation working papers. Rochester, NY: 1981.

Chernik, Barbara E. Introduction to library services for library technicians. Littleton, CO: Libraries Unlimited, 1982, pp. 131-135.

Cherry, Susan S. Public library branches in schools: The Kansas City experience. American Libraries, 1982, 13(1), 24-28.

Clark, Geraldine. Echoes of 60's advocacy in the school media center of the 80's. American Libraries, 1979, 10(6), 369-372.

Clemmer, Dan and Shank, Russell. Interlibrary and information networks. In Bowker annual of library and book trade information, pp. 299-303. New York: R. R. Bowker, 1971.

Colorado Library Association. Public library trustees of Colorado: Responsibilities and opportunities. A manual for the trustees of

Colorado public libraries. Denver: Colorado Library Association, 1980. 53pp. ED 200 255.

Connor, Jean L. A selective bibliography on multitype library service, 1970-1975. Stanford, CA: ERIC Clearinghouse on Information Resources, Stanford University, 1976. 24pp. ED 122 826.

Cuadra, Carlos A. et al. A library and information science research agenda for the 1980s: Summary report. Santa Monica, CA: Cuadra Associates, Inc., 1982. 54pp. ED 211 124.

Deer, Elva Mae. The role of the school in library networks: A bibliographic essay. Catholic Library World, 1980, 51(9), 381-383.

DeGennaro, Richard. From monopoly to competition: The changing library network scene. Library Journal, 1979, 102(12), 1215-1217.

DeGennaro, Richard. Libraries and networks in transition: Problems and prospects for the 1980s. Library Journal, 1981, 104(11), 1045-1049.

DeJohn, William. Impact of technology and networks. Library Trends, 1980, 28(4), 633-648.

DeJohn, William and Lamont, Bridget (Eds.). The multitype library network. Illinois Libraries, 1975, 57(6), entire issue. 88pp. ED 108 692.

A developing state plan for library services. Trenton, NJ: New Jersey State Library, 1980. 38pp. ED 201 332.

Dodson, James T. Council for computerized library networks. In Bowker annual of library and book trade information, pp. 94-96. New York: R. R. Bowker, 1977.

Doll, Carol A. Overlap studies of library collections in school and public libraries. Public Libraries, 1982, 21(1), 33-34.

Doll, Carol A. A study of overlap and duplication among children's collections in public and elementary school libraries. Docotoral

dissertation, University of Illinois, 1980. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1981, 41(11), 4528A. (University Microfilms No. 81-08,492)

Dowling, Karen. The school media center goes online. Catholic Library World, 1981, 53 (2), 120-121.

Dowling, Karen and Kirsch, Judy. On-line information retrieval in a local educational agency. School Media Quarterly, 1977, 6(1), 33-38.

Drake, Miriam A. The economics of library networks. In Barbara E. Markuson and Blanche Woolls (Eds.), Networks for networkers: Critical issues in cooperative library development, pp. 211-243. New York: Neal Schuman, 1980.

Drescher, Robert A. School library cooperation in the Illinois Library and Information Network (ILLINET). Illinois Libraries, 1976, 58(7), 543-551.

Drescher, Robert A. Children's services/school services liaison. Illinois Libraries, 1976, 58(10), 821-823.

Drexel Library Quarterly, 1977, 13(2), entire issue.

Driver, Russell W. and Driver, Mary Anne. Automation in school library media centers. School Library Journal, 1982, 28(5), 21-25.

Drott, M. Carl and Mancall, Jacqueline C. Materials students use: A direct measurement approach. In David V. Loertscher (Ed.), School library media center: Research studies and the state-of-the-art: Six research briefs, pp. 21-30. Syracuse, NY: ERIC Clearinghouse on Information Resources, 1980. ED 195 287.

Duggan, Maryann. Library network analysis and planning (LIB-NAT). Journal of Library Automation, 1969, 2(3), 157-175.

Duhrsen, Lowell R. Use of the New Mexico State University Library by high school students in Las Cruces, NM. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1981, 42(6), 2343A.

Dyer, Esther R. Cooperation in library services to children. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1978.

Dyer, Esther R. Including school libraries in national bibliographic systems. International Library Review, 1979, 11(4), 451-462.

Dyer, Esther R. New perspective on cooperation in library services to children. School Media Quarterly, 1977, 5(4), 261-270.

Eckard, Helen M. Directory of library networks and cooperative library organizations, 1980 (NCES 80-226). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, 1980.

Evans, Glyn T. Library networks. In Annual review of information science and technology, Vol. 16, pp. 211-245. White Plains, NY: Knowledge Industry Publications, 1981.

Evans, Glyn T. On-line library networking: A bibliographic essay. Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science, 1979, 5(5), 11-14.

Falsone, Anne Marie. Participation of school libraries. In Beth Hamilton and William B. Ernst, Jr. (Eds.), Multitype library cooperation, pp. 133-137. New York: R. R. Bowker, 1977.

Fasana, Paul J. 1981 and beyond: Visions and decisions. Journal of Library Automation, 1980 13(2), 96-107.

Fite, Alice E. Networking: An old word goes back to school. American Libraries, 1978, 9(10), 603-604.

Fite, Alice E. Report of Task Force on Role of the School Library Program in Networking. School Media Quarterly, 1979, 7(2), 89-114.

Fite, Alice E. and Macon, M. Networking for school media specialists. Mississippi Libraries, 1980, 44(2), 87-90.

Fleming, Lois D. Public and school libraries: Partners in the "big" picture. School Media Quarterly, 1978, 7(1), 25-30.

Ford, Barbara J. Illinois. In ALA yearbook 1982, pp. 321-322. Chicago, IL: American Library Association, 1982.

Franckowiak, Barnard M. Networks, data bases, and media programs: An overview. School Media Quarterly, 1977, 6(1), 15-20.

Franckowiak, Bernard M. School library media programs and the National Program for Library and Information Services. Washington, DC: National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, 1974. 21pp. ED 100 393.

Franckowiak, Bernard M. Views of the national program. In Networks: Who, why, how?, pp. 103-106. Madison, WI: State Department of Public Instruction, 1975. ED 108 693. Also in Wisconsin Library Bulletin, 1975, 71(3), 103-106.

Glizt, Beryl. Networks: A bibliography. Unpublished paper, 1977. 43pp. ED 139 428.

Glossary of computer terms. Kansas City, MO: DataPhase Systems, 1981.

Gore, Daniel. Nothing succeeds like excess: An essay on interlibrary loan. Library Journal, 1982, 107(14), 1375-1478.

Gorman, Michael. Network! Or I'm rational (mad) as hell and I'm not going to take it any more. American Libraries, 1980, 11(1), 48-50.

Governance of networks. Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science, 1980, 6(5), 10-20.

Grazier, Margaret Hayes. Critique of the NCLIS draft program. School Media Quarterly, 1974, 2(4), 329-331.

Grove, Pearce S. (Ed.). Library Cooperation. Library Trends, 1975, 24(2), entire issue.

Hamilton, Beth and William B. Ernst, Jr. Multitype library cooperation. New York: R. R. Bowker, 1977.

Hanson, Carol and Hangartner, Eugenia. Sharing is contagious. Wisconsin Library Bulletin, 1977, 73(2), 57-59.

Hart, Thomas L. Centralized processing: Gain or bane? School Media Quarterly, 1975, 3(3), 210-214.

Hayes, Robert M. The national library network, its economic rationale and funding. Washington, DC: National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, 1974. 49pp. ED 114 098.

Hayes, Robert M. and Palmer, Susan E. The effects of distance upon use of libraries: Case studies based on a survey of users of the Los Angeles Public Library--Central Library and branches. Unpublished paper, 1982.

Heintze, Robert A. Statistics of public school libraries/media centers, fall 1978 (NCES 81-254). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, 1981.

Heller, Dawn H. So what about networks. School Library Journal, 1978, 25(4), 38.

Hicks, Doris A. and Shaloiko, John. Rochester (NY) Area Resource Exchange: An intersystem pilot project. Catholic Library World, 1981, 52(7), 291-296.

Hines, Theodore C. et al. Computer-based systems for increasing information access to school media center materials. Final report. Greensboro, NC: School of Education, North Carolina University, 1978. 170pp. ED 172 826.

Immroth, Barbara. The role of the school library media program in a multi-type network. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1980, 41(12), 4872A. (University Microfilms No. 8112714)

Inserra, Albert F. Networking at the intermediate service agency level. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, March 1982. 14pp. ED 217 836.

Johnson, Mary Frances K. and Hines, Theodore C. School media programs and networking: A position paper. Greensboro, NC: North Carolina University, School of Education, 1977. 34pp. ED 175 422.

Kent, Allen and Galvin, Thomas (Eds.). Library resource sharing. New York: Marcel Dekker, 1977.

Kent, Allen and Galvin, Thomas J. The structure and governance of library networks. New York: Marcel Dekker, 1979.

Knievel, Helen (Ed.). Cooperative services: A guide to policies and procedures in library systems. New York: Neal-Schuman, 1982.

Kolb, Audrey. Development and potential of a multitype library network. School Media Quarterly, 1977, 6(1), 21-27.

Kolb, Audrey and Morse, Jo. Initiating school participation in networking. School Media Quarterly, 1977, 6(1), 52-59.

Kreigh, Helen. School/public library access. In Networks: Who, why, how?, pp. 109-110. Madison, WI: State Department of Public Instruction, 1975. ED 108 693. Also in Wisconsin Library Bulletin, 1975, 71(3), 109-110.

Lamont, Bridget L. Impact of networking on services for children. Illinois Libraries, 1976, 58(10), 817-819.

Land, Phyllis. Networking. In Thomas J. Galvin et al. (Eds.), Excellence in school media programs, pp. 176-181. Chicago: American Library Association, 1980.

Laughlin, Mildred. Action activities: 37 ways to do it. (Bring school and public librarians together). Learning Today, 1978, 11 (Spring), 72-76.

Linsley, Laurie S. Academic libraries in an interlibrary loan network. College and Research Libraries, 1982, 43(4), 292-299.

Linsley, Laurie S. Florida Interlibrary Loan Improvement project. Final report. Tallahassee, FL: Florida Department of State and the State Library, 1980. 123pp. ED 200 209.

Loertscher, David V. Networking and school library media centers: A position paper. Idaho Falls, ID: Hi Willow Research and Publishing, 1977.

Loertscher, David V. The second revolution: A taxonomy for the 1980s. Wilson Library Bulletin, 1982, 56(6), 417-421.

Luskay, Jack R. The White House Conference on Library and Information Services, November 15-19, 1979: A report. School Library Media Quarterly, 1980, 8(3), 137-152.

Lynch, Beverly P. Networks and other cooperative enterprises: Their effects on the function of reference. RQ, 1976, 15(3), 197-202.

Lynch, Eugene. School cooperation in CLSU Region Six examined. Connecticut Libraries, 1982, 24 (Winter), 16-17.

Lynch, Eugene. A survey of school library participation in cooperative activities in southeastern Connecticut. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Connecticut Educational Media Association, October 1981. 32pp. ED 215 689.

Making cooperation work (Library Journal Special Report #9). New York: R. R. Bowker, 1979.

McCallan, Norma J. Delivery systems and programs. Library Trends, 1980, 28(4), 525-559.

McClarren, Robert T. State legislation relative to library systems. Library Trends, 1970, 19(2), 235-249.

Malinconico, S. Michael. The National Bibliographic Network: A patrician pursuit. Library Journal, 1980, 106(2), 1791-1792.

Mancall, Jacqueline C. and Drott, M. Carl. Tomorrow's scholars: Patterns of facilities use. School Library Journal, 1980, 26(7), 99-103.

Markuson, Barbara E. Analysis of requirements of on-line network cataloging services for small academic, public, school, and other libraries: A demonstration project using the OCLC systems. Final report. Washington, DC: U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1977. 60pp. ED 140 861.

Markuson, Barbara E. Library network planning. In Networks: Who, why, how?, pp. 98-102. Madison, WI: State Department of Public Instruction, 1975. ED 108 693. Also in Wisconsin Library Bulletin, 1975, 71(3), 98-102.

Markuson, Barbara E. and Woolls, Blanche (Eds.). Networks for networkers: Critical issues in cooperative library development. New York: Neal-Schuman, 1980.

Martin, Susan K. Library networking in the United States, 1981. In Bowker annual of library and book trade information, pp. 78-82. New York: R. R. Bowker, 1982.

Martin, Susan K. Library networks, 1981-82. 4th ed. White Plains, NY: Knowledge Industry Publications, 1980.

Martin, Susan K. The quest for a National Bibliographic Network. Library Journal, 1978, 103(1), 19-22.

Maryland. Department of Education. Maryland Plan for Libraries, 1981-1986. Baltimore, MD: State Department of Education, 1981. 56pp.

Maryland. Department of Education. Project LIFE (Library Information and Functional Exchange): Policy handbook. Baltimore, MD: State Department of Education, 1981.

Maryland. Department of Education, Division of Library Development and Services. Report 78. Baltimore, MD: State Department of Education, 1978. 33pp. ED 183 517.

Maryland. Department of Education. Division of Library Development and Services. Report 80. Baltimore, MD: State Department of Education, 1981. 28pp.

Maryland. State Library Resource Center. Annual report: Fiscal year 1981. Baltimore, MD: Maryland State Library, 1981.

Meyers, Judith K. and Barber, Raymond W. The media supervisor and the selection process. Drexel Library Quarterly, 1978, 14(3), 45-64.

Miller, Marilyn L. Children's access to library systems. In Zena Sutherland (Ed.), Children in libraries: Patterns of access to materials and services in school and public libraries, pp. 38-53. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.

Morris, Lloyd P. Teleducation: Networks for knowledge. Library Trends, 1971, 19(4), 482-492.

National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Annual report to the President and Congress. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970-1980, ED 212 285; 1977-1978, ED 191 425.

National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Problems in bibliographic access to non-print materials. Project Media Base: Final report. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979. 86pp. ED 185 968.

National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. The role of the school library media program in networking. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978. (S/N 052-003-00622-7). ED 168 599. Also in School Media Quarterly, 1979, 7(2), 88-114.

National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Toward a national program for library and information services: Goals for action. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975. 106pp. ED 107 312.

Network development in Canada. In Bowker annual of library and trade book information, pp. 436-439. New York: R. R. Bowker, 1982.

Networking: North America. Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science, 1979, 5(5), 11-31.

Networks in education: Special double issue. Education Libraries, 1982, 7(1-2), entire issue.

New Jersey. State Library. Interlibrary loan and photocopy information and procedures. Newark, NJ: New Jersey State Library, 1981. 55pp.

New York. State Education Department. Growth in cooperation. Albany, NY: The University of the State of New York, 1981. 92pp. ED 215 690.

New York. State Education Department. New directions: A report of the Commissioner of Education to the New York State Legislature on library pilot projects, 1979-1980. Albany, NY: The University of the State of New York, 1980. 85+pp.

New York. State Education Department. Report of the Commissioner of Education to the New York State Legislature on library pilot projects, December 15, 1978 through August 31, 1979. Albany, NY: The University of the State of New York, 1979. 74pp. ED 186 040.

New York City System pilot project, 1980-1981. Brooklyn, NY: New York City Board of Education, Office of Educational Evaluation, 1981. 9pp. ED 212 711.

Palmour, Vernon E. and Roderer, Nancy K. Library resource sharing through networks. In Martha Williams (Ed.), Annual review of information science and technology, Vol. 13, pp. 147-177. White Plains, NY: Knowledge Industry Publications, 1978.

Patrick, Retta. School library media programs today: The taxonomy applied. Wilson Library Bulletin, 1982, 56(6), 422-427.

Pettem, Doug. Problems in school and public library resource sharing. Canadian Library Journal, 1978, 36(5), 361-363.

Perspectives on... library networks and resource sharing. Journal of the American Society for Information Science, 1980, 31(6), 404-444.

Pond, Patricia and Liesener, James W. Networks, data bases, and media programs. School Media Quarterly, 1977, 6(1), 9-38, 51-59.

Professional librarian's reader in library automation and technology. White Plains, NY: Knowledge Industry Publications, 1980.

Public library/school media center relationship. Minnesota Libraries, 1980, 26(6), 594-598.

Resource Sharing and Library Networks (quarterly), v.1, no.1 Fall 1981-.

Rogers, JoAnn V. Mainstreaming media center materials: Adopting AACR2. School Library Journal, 1981, 27(8), 32-35.

Role of school libraries in national network sketched. Library Journal, 1979, 104(6), 664-665.

Role of school media programs in networks and interlibrary cooperation. Wisconsin Library Bulletin, 1977, 73(6), 259-262.

Rouse, Sandra H. A selected review of the literature on interlibrary loan networks. Network, 1975, 2(1), 17-25.

Rouse, William B. and Rouse, Sandra H. Management of library networks. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1980.

Ryan, Carol Ward. NEWIL interlibrary loan study. Wisconsin Library Bulletin, 1980, 76(4), 171-174.

Salmon, Stephen R. Library automation. In Allen Kent et al. (Eds.), Encyclopedia of library and information science 1975, Vol. 14, pp. 338-445. New York: Marcel Dekker, 1975.

School Library Journal, 1979, 26(4), entire issue.

Shank, Russell. Library and information networks. In Bowker annual of library and book trade information, pp. 90-95. New York: R. R. Bowker, 1972.

Shank, Russell. Networks. In Bowker annual of library and book trade information, pp. 290-295. New York: R. R. Bowker, 1970.

Shockey, Annette. School and public library cooperation: A call to action. Catholic Library World, 1978, 49(10), 438-440.

Smith, Susan. The research implications of the NCLIS Task Force report on the role of the school library media program in networking. School Media Quarterly, 1980, 8(3), 179-183.

Sones, C. Mary. School-public library co-operation adds strengths and resources. Canadian Library Journal, 1981, 38(2), 85-90.

Sorensen, Richard. The role of school media professionals in library networks. In Barbara Markuson and Blanche Woolls (Eds.), Networks for networkers, pp. 309-319. New York: Neal-Schuman, 1980.

Sorensen, Richard. School library media programs in library networks: Selected documents, 1981. Washington, DC:

National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, 1982. 3 microfiche.

Stevens, Charles H. Governance of library networks. Library Trends, 1977, 26(2), 219-240.

Stevens, Norman D. An historical perspective on the concept of networks: Some preliminary considerations. In Barbara Markuson and Blanche Woolls (Eds.), Networks for networkers, pp. 29-48. New York: Neal-Schuman, 1980a.

Stevens, Norman D. Library networks and resource sharing in the United States: An historical and philosophical overview. Journal of the American Society for Information Science, 1980b, 31(6), 405-412.

Sullivan, Peggy A. Library cooperation to serve youth. In JoAnn Rogers (Ed.), Libraries and young adults, pp. 113-118. Littleton, CO: Libraries Unlimited, 1979.

Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors. 8th edition. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press, 1980.

Trezza, Alphonse. Networks. In ALA yearbook 1981, pp. 205-210; 1982, p. 220-224. Chicago: American Library Association, 1981, 1982.

Turock, Betty J. Performance, organization and attitude: Factors in multitype library networking. Doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, 1981. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1982, 43(04), 963A. (University Microfilms No. DA 82-21,716)

Twaddle, Dan R. School media services and automation. School Media Quarterly, 1979, 7(4), 257-268, 273-276.

Van Orsdel, Darrell E. Cooperation with results. In Networks: Who, why, how?, pp. 113-114. Madison, WI: State Department of Public Instruction, 1975. ED 108 693. Also in Wisconsin Library Bulletin, 1975, 71(3), 113-114.

Veaner, Allen. Technical services research needs for the 1990s. Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Library Association, July 1982.

Walker, H. Thomas. A study of the participation of a public school system in a large public and academic interlibrary consortium. Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1982. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1983, 43(07), 2144A. (University Microfilms No. DA 82-28,005)

Weeks, Ann Carlson. A study of the attitudes of New York media specialists concerning library networking and technology. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1982.

Wheelbarger, Johnny J. and Clouse, R. Wilburn. Legal ramifications of computerized library networks and their implications for the library director. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, 1981. 20pp. ED 206 325.

White House Conference on Library and Information Services. Information for the 1980's. Final Report of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services, 1979. Washington, DC: National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, 1980. 802pp. ED 206 280.

Winters, Robert (Comp.). School public library cooperation. Unpublished bibliography, 1978. 8pp. ED 176 745.

Wisconsin. Department of Public Instruction. District level instructional media programs in Wisconsin public schools, 1982: A status report. Madison, WI: State Department of Public Instruction, 1982. 16pp.

Wisconsin. Department of Public Instruction. Instructional media programs in the state library network: A policy statement. Madison, WI: State Department of Public Instruction, 1980. 9pp. ED 192 727.

Wisconsin. Department of Public Instruction. Public library and school library organizational relationships and interlibrary cooperation: A policy statement. Madison, WI: State Department of Public Instruction, 1976a. ED 129 321. Also in Wisconsin Library Bulletin, 1976, 72(3), 131-134.

Wisconsin. Department of Public Instruction. School-public library services within a community: Problems and questions on

consolidation. A policy statement. Madison, WI: State Department of Public Instruction, 1976b. 7pp. ED 129 322.

Wisconsin. Department of Public Instruction. Wisconsin library network plan report: Recommendations for network development at the area level. Madison, WI: State Department of Public Instruction, 1981a. 68pp.

Wisconsin. Department of Public Instruction. Wisconsin library record, 1978. Madison, WI: State Department of Public Instruction, 1979. 150pp. ED 184 552.

Wisconsin. Department of Public Instruction. Wisconsin library service record, 1980. Madison, WI: State Department of Public Instruction, 1981b. 79pp.

Wisconsin Library Bulletin, 1975, 71(3).

Wisconsin Library Bulletin, 1981, 77(3), entire issue.

Woolard, Wilma Lee Broughton. Combined school/public libraries: A survey with conclusions and recommendations. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1980.

Woolls, Blanche. Cooperative library services in public libraries and public school systems in selected communities of Indiana. Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, School of Library and Information Science, 1973. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34(03), 1304A. (University Microfilms No. 73-19,750)

Woolls, Blanche. Warp, woof and loom: Networks, users, and information systems. In Barbara Markuson and Blanche Woolls (Eds.), Networks for networkers, pp. 276-290. New York: Neal-Schuman, 1980.

Appendix A

COLORADO INTERLIBRARY LOAN CODE, 1971/1972

This code is a voluntary agreement proposed by the Colorado Interlibrary Loan Code Workshop, April 23, 1971, and adopted by:

Association of Colorado Community College Learning Resource Centers
Bibliographical Center for Research, Rocky Mountain Region, Inc.
Colorado Association of Independent Colleges and Universities
Colorado Association of School Libraries
Colorado Board of Education
Colorado Council of Medical Libraries
Colorado Council of Academic Libraries
Colorado Council for Library Development
Colorado Library Association
Colorado State Library

Special Libraries Association, Colorado Chapter
to govern interlibrary lending among libraries in the state of Colorado. Although correlated with the ALA National Interlibrary Loan Code, 1968 (adopted by the Reference Service Division, acting for the American Library Association on June 27, 1968) this local code is intended to promote a more liberalized interlibrary loan policy among the libraries adopting it. It is based on the premise that lending among libraries for the use of an individual in the state of Colorado is in the public interest and should be encouraged. However, liberal interlibrary lending should be no substitute for the development of adequate collections based on the needs of the service areas represented in the libraries and library systems.

This code may be further expanded or modified to meet the particular interests of participating libraries.

The American Library Association has published a procedures manual (Thomson, Sarah Katharine, Interlibrary Loan Procedure Manual, Chicago, American Library Association, 1970) suggested for use in implementing the national code; libraries requesting materials on loan under the provisions of the local code are urged to follow the recommendations of the manual.

I. Definition

Interlibrary loans are transactions in which library materials (book and non-book) are made available by one library to another; for the purposes of this code they also include the provision of copies as substitutes for loans of the original materials.

II. Purpose

Since it is increasingly evident that it is impossible for any one library to be self-sufficient, and in the belief that the furtherance of knowledge is in the general interest, interlibrary borrowing and lending is regarded by the libraries subscribing to this agreement as essential to library service.

III. Eligibility

Any patron normally considered to be part of the borrowing library's clientele should be eligible for interlibrary loan privileges if the request is judged to legitimate by the borrowing library.

IV. Responsibility of Lending Libraries

1. Lending libraries have the responsibility of informing borrowing libraries of any failure to observe the provisions of this code, and if necessary may invoke the provisions stated in Sec. XIII.

2. Lending libraries will practice as liberal and unrestrictive a policy as is possible in interlibrary loans, with due consideration to the interests of their primary clientele.

V. Responsibility of Borrowing Libraries

1. It is recognized that interlibrary lending does not relieve any library of the responsibility of developing its own collection. Each library will provide the resources to meet the ordinary study, educational, instructional, informational, recreational and research needs of its users. Requests to borrow from other libraries will be limited to those items which the library might not be expected to own. No library should depend upon another to supply the normal needs of its clientele except under special agreement for such service.

2. Borrowing libraries will make every effort to exhaust their own resources before resorting to interlibrary loans.

3. Borrowing libraries will screen carefully all applications for loans, rejecting those which do not conform to this code. (See also Art. VIII, Conditions of Loans; Art. X, Form of Request.)

VI. Scope

1. Any type of library material needed for the purposes of study, instruction, information, recreation or research may be requested on loan or in photocopy from another library. The lending library has the privilege of deciding in each case whether a particular

item should or should not be provided, and whether the original or a copy should be sent. These decisions may be determined by the nature of the material, its physical condition, or the degree of active demand for the material requested.

2. Under the terms of this agreement it is permissible to request on interlibrary loan:

   a. Materials collected in specialized subject fields and in special non-restricted collections;

   b. Materials collected under special acquisition agreements;

   c. Materials bought or acquired under special grant or other programs including depository agreements, intended to promote economical use of the total resources of the area;

   d. Reference materials whenever lending might not hinder the service of the lending library.

3. Under the terms of this agreement borrowing libraries will not ordinarily request:

   a. Books in current and/or recurring demand;

   b. Bulky or fragile materials;

   c. Rare materials;

   d. A large number of titles for one person at any one time;

   e. Duplicates of titles already owned;

   f. Original materials which can be copied cheaply;

   g. Materials for class, reserve, or other group use;

   h. Inexpensive items currently purchasable.

4. Each participating library will prepare a statement of its interlibrary loan policies and procedures to further supplement the national and state codes and will make this statement available to all participating libraries.

VII. Expenses

1. The borrowing library should be prepared to assume any costs charged by the lending library as agreed upon in this code. If the charges are more than nominal, and not authorized beforehand by the borrowing library, the lending library will inform the requesting library and obtain authorization to proceed with the transaction. Borrowing libraries should attempt to anticipate charges and authorize them on the initial request.

2. In the interests of efficiency the lending library may agree to absorb nominal costs for:

   a. Postage;

   b. Photocopying;

   c. Insurance.

3. Libraries may make special contractual or other arrangements, including financial reimbursement or other adjustments, in recognition of costs incurred by libraries whose resources are used extensively under this agreement.

VIII. Conditions of Loans

1. The borrowing library will honor any limitations on use imposed by the lending library.

2. Unless specifically forbidden by the lending library, it is assumed that copying is permitted, provided that it is in accordance with copyright law and ALA policy and further, provided no damage to the original volume will result.

3. The borrowing library is responsible for returning loans promptly and in good condition.

4. The safety of borrowed materials is the responsiblity of the borrowing library. The borrowing library will meet all costs of repair or replacement in accordance with the preferences of the lending library.

IX. Placement of Requests

1. Special arrangements for lending of materials by designated resource libraries may be made within the context of this agreement. Requests should be routed through such established channels as may be agreed upon by libraries participating in local, state, or regional plans for library service. In Colorado, all public, school district and community college libraries will place requests through the statewide reference service network unless other arrangements have been made for direct service.

2. Every effort will be made to locate materials through available local, state, and regional union catalogs, book catalogs, and union lists. In Colorado all libraries subscribing to this code are encouraged to cooperate with the Bibliographical Center for Research, Rocky Mountain Region, Inc., in order to expedite interlibrary loan procedures.

3. Requests may be made by mail, or transmitted by special or regularly scheduled messenger service, using the standard ALA

form or the ALA photoduplication form (or a mutually acceptable form) or by teletype, using a format based on the standard form. When mutually agreeable, telephone requests are acceptable and shall be confirmed by the mailing of the standard form unless the lending library waives this record.

4. No library will lend directly to an individual on an interlibrary loan basis, except by mutual agreement between the borrowing and lending libraries.

X. Form of Request

1. Materials requested must be described as completely and accurately as possible following accepted bibliographic practice.

2. All items requested shall be verified in standard bibliographic tools and sources of verification cited. When the item requested cannot be verified, the statement "cannot verify" shall be indicated, and complete information as to source of reference furnished.

3. If verification is disregarded, or the bibliographic data is incorrect, and unless special agreement otherwise provides, the lending library may return the request unfilled without special effort to identify the reference.

4. The name and status (position or other identifying information) of the individual for whom the material is being requested shall appear on the request form.

5. All requests and shipments shall be conspicuously labled "Inter-library Loan."

XI. Duration of Loan

1. Unless otherwise specified by the lending library, the duration of the loan shall be calculated as the time the item is to be in the borrowing library, disregarding the time spent in transit. The period of loan shall be that ordinarily extended by the lending library

2. Renewal requests shall be kept to a minimum. The renewal request shall be sent in time to reach the lending library before the due date. The lending library should respond to renewal requests promptly; if it does not, it will be assumed that renewal for the same period as the original loan is granted.

3. The loan period specified by the lending library should be appropriate to the type of material.

4. Material on loan may be subject to recall; the borrowing library shall comply promptly.

XII. Notification and Acknowledgement

1. The lending library shall notify the borrowing library promptly whether or not the material is being sent; if the material cannot be supplied, the lending library shall state the reason.

2. Except in the case of very valuable shipments, no acknowledgement of receipt is necessary. If there is undue delay in receipt of shipments, the borrowing library shall notify the lending library so that a search may be initiated.

XIII. Violation of the Code

Continued disregard of the provisions of this code shall be sufficient reason for suspension of borrowing privileges.

Appendix B

Connecticut

General Statutes Sec.11-9a. Appointment and Duties of Cooperative Library Service Unit Review Board

(a) For the purposes of this act, a "library service unit" means an entity providing library and information service from an organized body of recorded knowledge which may be in the form of books, periodicals, audio or video recordings on film, disc or tape; machine-stored information or knowledge preserved in any other recorded form, and which service was created and continues to exist for the purpose of transmitting such knowledge to mankind.

(b) The state library committee shall appoint a fifteen member cooperating library service unit review board, representing special, school, academic and public library interests and existing regional cooperating library service units. Such board shall establish criteria for, and encourage the formation of, a system of regional cooperating library service units and shall report its recommendations annually to the state library committee and the joint standing committee on education of the general assembly. The members of the cooperating library service unit review board shall serve without compensation or reimbursement of expenses. Approved June 19, 1975.

Appendix C

Illinois Statutes. 81 Para. 121

121. Reduction of tax levy-Reduction of grants

Sec. 11. In the event that any library participating in a system reduces the amount of its annual public library tax levy to an amount which is less than the average amount levied for the 3 years immediately preceding the establishment of the system for non-capital expenditures, the annual per capita and area grants to which such library system would otherwise be entitled shall be reduced by 25%, until such time as it again levies an amount equal to that average.

Amended by Laws 1967, p. 2870, eff. Aug. 11, 1967.

Appendix D

Interlibrary Loan Code for Illinois

This code is an agreement adopted by the Reference and Research Libraries and the Illinois Library Systems on 1 May 1971, to govern interlibrary lending. Although correlated with the American Library Association National Interlibrary Loan Code, 1968, (adopted by the Reference Service Division, acting for the American Library Association on June 27, 1968) this code is intended to promote a more liberalized interlibrary loan policy among the libraries adopting it. It is based on the premise that lending among libraries for the use of an individual in Illinois is in the public interest and should be encouraged. However, liberal interlibrary lending should be no substitute for the development of adequate collections based on the needs of the service areas represented, in libraries and library systems.

The American Library Association has published a procedures manual suggested for use in implementing the national code; libraries requesting materials on loan under the provisions of this code are urged to follow the recommendations of the manual.

I. Definition

1. Interlibrary loans are transactions in which library materials are made available by one library to another; for the purposes of this code they also include the provision of copies as substitutes for loans of the original materials.

II. Purpose

1. Since it is increasingly evident that it is impossible for any one library to be self-sufficient, and in the belief that the furtherance of knowledge is in the general interest, interlibrary borrowing and lending is regarded by the libraries subscribing to this agreement as essential to library service.

III. Responsibility of Lending Libraries

1. Lending libraries have the responsibility of informing borrowing libraries of any failure to observe the provisions of this code, and, if necessary, may invoke the provisions stated in Sec. XII.

2. Lending libraries will pratice as liberal and unrestrictive a policy as is possible in interlibrary loans, with due consideration to the interests of their primary clientele.

IV. Responsibility of Borrowing Libraries

1. It is recognized that interlibrary lending does not relieve any library of the responsibility of developing its own collection. Each library will provide the resources to meet the ordinary study, educational, instructional, informational, and research needs of its users. Requests to borrow from other libraries will be limited to those items which the library might not be expected to own. No library should depend upon another to supply the normal needs of its clientele except under special agreement for such service.

2. Borrowing libraries will make every effort to exhaust their own resources before resorting to interlibrary loans.

3. Borrowing libraries will screen carefully all applications for loans, rejecting those which do not conform to this code. (See also Art. VII, Conditions of Loans; Art. IX, Form of Request.)

V. Scope

1. Any type of library material needed for the purposes of study, instruction, information, or research may be requested on loan or in photocopy from another library. The lending library has the privilege of deciding in each case whether a particular item should or should not be provided, and whether the original or a copy should be sent. These decisions should be determined by the nature of the material or its physical condition, the degree of active demand for the material requested (or other reasons specifically indicated in this agreement).

2. Under the terms of this agreement it is permissible to request on interlibrary loan:

   a. Materials collected in specialized subject fields and in special nonrestricted collections;

   b. Materials collected under special acquisitions agreements;

   c. Materials bought under special grant or other programs intended to promote economical use of the total resources of the area;

   d. Reference materials whenever lending might not hinder the service of the lending library.

3. Under the terms of this agreement, borrowing libraries will not ordinarily request:

   a. Books in current and/or recurring demand;

   b. Bulky or fragile materials;

   c. Rare materials;

   d. A large number of titles for one person at any one time;

   e. Duplicates of titles already owned;

   f. Materials which can be copied cheaply;

   g. Materials for class, reserve, or other group use.

VI. Expenses

1. The borrowing library should be prepared to assume any costs charged by the lending library as agreed upon in this code. If the charges are more than nominal, and not authorized beforehand by the borrowing library, the lending library will inform the requesting library and obtain authorization to proceed with the transaction. Borrowing libraries should attempt to anticipate charges and authorize them on the initial request.

2. In the interests of efficiency the lending library will absorb nominal costs for:

   a. Postage and insurance one way;

   b. Photocopying up to ten exposures.

VII. Conditions of Loans

1. The borrowing library will honor any limitations on use imposed by the lending library.

2. Unless specifically forbidden by the lending library, it is assumed that copying is permitted, provided that it is in accordance with copyright law and ALA policy and further, provided no damage to the original volume will result.

3. The borrowing library is responsible for returning loans promptly and in good condition.

4. The safety of borrowed materials is the responsibility of the borrowing library. The borrowing library will meet all costs of repair or replacement in accordance with the preference of the lending library.

VIII. Placement of Requests

1. Requests should be routed from the local library to the system. If the requests cannot be filled within the system, they should be routed to the Reference and Research Centers.

2. Every effort will be made at the system level to locate materials through available local, state, and regional union catalogs, book catalogs, and union lists.

3. Requests may be made by mail, or transmitted by special or regularly scheduled messenger service, using the standard ALA form or the ALA photoduplication form (or a mutually acceptable form), or by teletype, using a format based on the standard form.

4. No library will lend directly to an individual on an interlibrary loan basis, except by mutual agreement between the borrowing and the lending libraries.

IX. Form of Request

1. Materials requested must be described as completely and accurately as possible, following accepted bibliographic practice.

2. All items requested shall be verified in standard bibliographic tools and sources of verification cited. When the item requested cannot be verified, the statement "cannot verify" shall be indicated, and complete information as to source of reference furnished.

3. If verification is disregarded, or the bibliographic data is incorrect, and unless special agreement otherwise provides, the lending library may return the request unfilled without special effort to identify the reference.

4. All requests and shipments shall be conspicuously labeled "Interlibrary Loan."

X. Duration of Loan

1. Unless otherwise specified by the lending library, the duration of the loan shall be calculated as the time the item is to be in the borrowing library, disregarding the time spent in transit. The period of loan shall be that ordinarily extended by the lending library.

2. Renewal requests shall be kept to a minimum. The renewal request shall be sent in time to reach the lending library

before the due date. The lending library should respond to renewal requests promptly; if it does not, it will be assumed that renewal for the same period as the original loan is granted.

3. The loan period specified by the lending library should be appropriate to the type of material.

4. The borrowing library is responsible for returning inter-library loans promptly and in good condition.

5. Material on loan is subject to recall at any time and the borrowing library shall comply promptly.

XI. Notification and Acknowledgement

1. The lending library shall notify the borrowing library promptly whether or not the material is being sent; if the material cannot be supplied, the lending library shall state the reason.
2. Except in the case of very valuable shipments, no acknowledgement of receipt is necessary. If there is undue delay in receipt of shipments, the borrowing library shall notify the lending library so that a search may be initiated.

XII. Violation of the code

1. Continued disregard of the provisions of this code shall be sufficient reason for suspension of borrowing privileges.

Appendix E

Iowa.

Governor's Conference on Library and Information Services. 1979.
Resolution:

Whereas library networks covering the State of Iowa are necessary for the effective distribution of library service and materials and;

Whereas no formal network exists for sharing resources among area education agencies nor for sharing with other agencies such as the regional library system serving public libraries, therefore;

Be it resolved that delegates to this Conference strongly endorse state legislation and funding to enable school libraries including area education agency media centers to establish a network system for sharing among the member units and to interface with the regional public library system such other systems as might be developed within the State, and the proposed national network.

Whereas the state agencies for school and public libraries are separate governmental units and the need exists for a coordinated program of library services;

Therefore be it resolved that the Iowa Governor's Pre-White House Conference on Libraries and Information Services recommends and urges the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the State Librarian to encourage the administrators of school systems and public libraries within the same geographical area to initiate cooperative plans in order to provide the fullest utilization of their collective resources throughout the year and with special consideration given to the needs of children and youth.

III. EVERYONE NEEDS THREE LIBRARIES*

Everyone needs at least three libraries - a personal library, a professional library, and a "public library." These libraries may contain some of the same materials but none can replace the need for the others.

Everyone needs a personal library. It may consist of nothing more than a television set, a radio, a telephone directory and a copy of the Bible, but it is needed for personal use on demand. The need cannot be handled easily by borrowing, nor is it convenient to lend such materials. In addition to the immediacy of need of the "primary user" personal libraries have inefficient circulation and control systems resulting in high loss of loaned materials.

Everyone needs a professional library. It may consist of nothing more than an automobile parts book but it is needed for one's profession too frequently and on too short notice to be shared easily. Extensive outside lending from such a collection is even more difficult since the demands of a profession can seldom wait. Checkout and control systems for outside use also tend to be inefficient. For the student and school teacher the professional library is the school library media center.

Everyone needs at least one "public library" - a library that can supplement or "back-up," one's personal and professional libraries. It may provide different versions of the Bible for the occasional study of a Sunday School teacher, or an automobile parts book for a weekend mechanic. In other words, many of the same materials and services available in personal and professional libraries would be available here, but to supplement these personal and professional libraries - "public libraries" cannot replace them.

---

* Distinctive Functions of School Media Centers and Public Libraries. (2d ed.). Des Moines, IA: Department of Public Instruction, 1981, pp. 6-7.) Various versions of this statement, all written by Betty Jo Buckingham, have appeared as an article in Iowa Association of School Librarians, Library Lines, March 1972, and have been distributed as leaflets at the University of Iowa, School of Library Science, Workshop on "Public Library/School Library Cooperation," March 10, 1978 and at the joint Iowa Library Association/Iowa Educational Media Association Conference, October 17-19, 1980.

For most people this "public library" may be just that - the local public library - but with increasing frequency back-up library services come in many guises and much of the back-up service is provided through "professional" and "public" libraries. The school library media center may turn to the district or Area Education Agency Media Center (AEAMC) for additional materials and production services, to the district, the AEA, or the State Department of Public Instruction for consultative services, to CNIR for audiovisual inservice materials for school teachers and administrators, and to the INFORMS network for computer assisted reference service for teachers and administrators.

The public libraries themselves are part of a network including the Regional Library System, the State Library, and ILITE, the state interlibrary loan network stretching throughout the state and beyond state boundaries.

These three necessary libraries may cooperate and may offer interlibrary loan services to strengthen and support each other but none can really replace the need for the others.

Appendix F

MINNESOTA MULTI-COUNTY MULTI-TYPE LIBRARY SYSTEMS RECOMMENDED PLANNING POLICIES AND PRINCIPLES

Principles

1. Services of multi-county multi-type library systems shall enhance the capacity of participating libraries to serve users.

2. Multi-county multi-type library systems shall be responsible for services to participating libraries; participating libraries are responsible for services to individuals.

3. Recognizing that cooperative service is intended to be a supplementary library resource and that each library has as its major responsibility service to its primary clientele, each participating library should have as its goal to fill at least 95% of its users requests from its resources.

4. Participation in a multi-county multi-type library system does not diminish the responsibility of the appropriating authority of each participant to provide adequate financial support to meet current and ongoing needs. Where evidence suggests that an appropriating authority is providing inadequate financial support or has reduced financial support because a library is participating in a multi-county multi-type library system, the governing board of the multi-county multi-type library system shall investigate and determine whether or not the library system shall be eligible to continue to participate. The governing board shall use as its standard of measurement for maintenance of effort the standards established in the following Federal programs: (1) Higher Education Act Title II-A for academic libraries, (2) Library Services and Construction Act Title I for public libraries, (3) Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title IV-B for school media centers.

5. Recognizing the diversity of purposes, functions, and concerns within types of libraries, particularly special libraries, and the importance of coordinating the multi-county multi-type library cooperation program with other cooperative programs within a region, the governing board of the multi-county multi-type library system is encouraged to establish ex-officio nonvoting representation on the advisory committee where feasible.

6. Participation in the multi-county multi-type library system shall not prevent participating libraries from using services available from other agencies.

7. Having agreed to participate in required services under its agreement with the multi-county multi-type library system, each participant may agree to use any or all additional services of the system to meet its needs.

8. Services developed by a multi-county multi-type library system shall be open to all types of participating libraries choosing to use them; services shall not be developed in which only a single type of library can participate.

9. Within some multi-county multi-type library systems and for some services, the most efficient and effective structure for delivery of services may be on a subregional basis.

10. Contracts between multi-county multi-type library systems are encouraged where this contributes to efficient delivery of services to libraries.

11. For purposes of caucuses and governance, a participating library is categorized as a public library, a school library media center, an academic library or a special library according to the criteria specified in the definitions.

12. The decision by a member library of a federated regional public library system not to participate in the multi-county multi-type library system shall not affect the library's membership in the federated regional library system or its eligibility for State and federal aid funds for public library services.

13. The planning process should include at least the following steps:

    a. Identification of libraries within the service area

    b. Needs assessment of participants (and potential participants)

    c. Development of goals and objectives

    d. Development of programs to meet objectives, including cost estimates

    e. Priority ranking of programs

Appendix G

New York.

Broome-Delaware-Tioga BOCES
School Library System
Interlibrary Loan Policy

I. Definition

An interlibrary loan is a transaction in which library materials, or copies of material, or resources are made available by one school library to another library.

II. Purpose

The purpose of interlibrary loan, as defined herein, is to provide access to library resources not available in the user's library.

III. Scope

A. A print or nonprint resource, or a copy of a print resource, may be requested from another library through the School Library System in accordance with the loan period established by the owning library.

B. The following types of materials will ordinarily not be loaned (but could be available for on-site access providing arrangments have been made in advance).

1. Rare, unique or valuable material which would be difficult or impossible to replace;
2. Bulky or fragile items which would create shipping problems;
3. Resources in demand at the lending library;
4. Resources with district and/or building restrictions (e.g. reference books).
5. Requests for classroom collections can not be accommodated.

C. The loan of any resources will be left to the discretion of the school library media person at all times.

IV. Copyright Compliance

The Copyright Law shall be adhered to at all times. (See Appendix A for Guidelines.)

V. Method of Request

A. The interlibrary loan forms supplied by the School Library System should be completed by the borrower. (See Appendix B for the interlibrary loan form.)

B. Verification

1. Bibliographic information must be as complete as possible when submitted to the School Library System. (See Appendix B for the interlibrary loan form.)

2. The source of verification should be stated.

3. It is recommended that each district assume the responsibility to purchase current bibliographic tools for this purpose.

C. All interlibrary loan requests must be submitted by the school library media person in the building/district.

VI. Responsibility of the Borrowing Library

A. The borrowing library and its users must comply with the conditions established by the lending library.

B. If the borrowing library permits its users to use the resources outside of the borrowing library, the borrowing library is responsible for:

1. Charging the materials out in an acceptable manner, and

2. Soliciting the prompt return of resources on or before the due date.

C. The borrowing library is responsible for returning the resources properly packaged, to the School Library System at BOCES.

D. The borrowing library is responsible for reporting losses and damages to the BOCES School Library System as soon as possible.

E. As in the past, the total responsibility for resources borrowed from other libraries that are not arranged through the BOCES School Library System, remains with the borrowing library.

VII. Responsibility of the Lending Library

A. The lending library must establish a reasonable loan period for materials loaned.

B. The lending library is to decide if a resource is eligible for interlibrary loan. If it is not, the reason should be stated upon request.

C. The lending library should respond to requests as promptly as possible.

D. The lending library is responsible for marking its ownership clearly on each item loaned.

E. The lending library will determine renewal loan privileges.

F. The lending library will determine replacement prices of in-print and out-of-print resources by using a comparable fair market value.

VIII. Responsibility of the BOCES School Library System

A. The BOCES School Library System will arrange for the transporting of interlibrary loan materials using the existing delivery system.

B. The BOCES School Library System will assume responsibility for resources lost or damaged beyond repair in transit.

C. The responsibility for resources borrowed from other libraries in the Broome-Delaware-Tioga BOCES School Library System remains with the borrowing library. However, if the borrowing library presents proof that all avenues of collection for lost or damaged materials have been exhausted, the BOCES School Library System will provide funds to help cover losses. The amount per district per year will be based on revenue and experience. (The Pilot Project budget will include funds to cover $100 of any losses and damages, which can not be collected by each district, during the 1979-80 school year and $100 for the same purpose for the 1980-81 school year.)

D. The BOCES School Library System will act as an intermediary in arranging loans and in soliciting the return of overdue resources.

E. The BOCES School Library System will make a serious effort to avoid concentrating the burden of requests on a few libraries.

IX. Method of Loan

The lending library may select the most satisfactory method:

A. Send the resource, properly packaged, to the BOCES School Library System via the existing delivery system.

B. Photocopy from a print resource (periodical article, short reference from a book).

C. Ask the BOCES School Library System to photocopy (for periodical articles, short references in a book) from a print resource.

X. Photocopying

A. The Copyright Law shall be adhered to at all times.

B. A maximum of ten pages per request will be supplied by the BOCES School Library System. Requests beyond this number of pages will be made only in cases where the borrower agrees to pay at the rate established.

XI. Duration of Loan

A. The duration of the loan is to be stated by the lending library.

B. All resources on loan are subject to immediate recall by the lending library. The borrower should comply promptly.

C. All interlibrary loan material should be returned promptly.

XII. Violation of Policy

Continued disregard of any provisions of this policy is sufficient reason for the suspension of a school's interlibrary borrowing privileges.

XIII. This policy shall be reviewed on a regular basis and revised when necessary.

4/13/80

LOAN POLICIES (Oswego County)

The following has been agreed upon as a policy for the Oswego County School Interlibrary Loan system. To request materials, the contact will be the school's Library Media Specialist, as listed in a directory.

Eligibility for Membership: Public and private Schools in Oswego County.

Eligibility to Borrow: Any student, teacher, administrator, or community member from a participating school is eligible to borrow. However, all requests will be placed by the school's Library Media Specialist.

Types of materials to be Loaned: All periodicals, monographs and nonprint materials with the exception of picture books and fiction books. Actual copies or photocopies at the discretion of the lending library.

Request Form to be Used: A.L.A. Interlibrary Loan Request Form or telephone with confirming form to follow.

Type of Loan: No restrictions unless indicated by lending library.

Length of Loan: Two weeks unless changed by mutual agreement.

Transportation: BOCES delivery or mail, as appropriate.

Photocopy Service: To be determined by each lending library and consistent with provisions of the Copyright Law.

Membership Fee: No assessment.

Liability: Cost of lost materials to be borne by borrowing library.

Appendix H

North Carolina's Governor's Conference on Library and Information Services. Resolutions,

RESOLVED: That the State of North Carolina create, with separate and additional funding, a Statewide information network, with planning and implementation to include: the appointment of a Task Force with representation from all types of libraries at the local, regional, and state levels, to address planning and governance of such a network; coordination with other State efforts in resource sharing of materials, personnel and bibliographic data and networking, existing and proposed, and with similar efforts at the national level; identification of services that would be created and/or made cost effective by centralization, computerization and other new technologies; examination of the process of library funding in North Carolina and the conditions placed on such funding in order that funding policies facilitate cooperation among all types of libraries; and, a plan to provide access at the local community level to major databases required by citizens in the pursuit of governmental decision making, community affairs, educational opportunitites, and other activities.

RESOLVED: That interlibrary loan is a basic service in all libraries and should be available to every citizen in the State, and that more expeditious delivery alternatives and coordination of services among regional, county, municipal, special, academic, and school libraries be explored by the State Library.

Appendix I

TEXAS EDUCATION CODE

Sec. 11.33. General Powers and Duties of Regional Education Service Centers

(a) (1) Regional Education Media Centers shall be established and operated by Regional Education Service Centers under rules of the State Board of Education in order to furnish participating school districts with education media materials, equipment and maintenance, and educational services.

(2) Centers approved by the State Board of Education as meeting their requirements shall develop, provide, and make available to participating school districts education media services.

(3) A Regional Education Media Center is an area center, composed of one or more Texas school districts, that is approved to house, circulate, and service educational media for the public schools of the participating districts.

(4) Any school district which is a participant member of a Regional Education Media Center may elect to withdraw its membership in the center for a succeeding scholastic year, electing not to support nor to receive its services for any succeeding year. Title to and all educational media and property purchased by the center shall remain with and in the center.

(5) The cost incident to setting up the centers, their operation, and the purchase of education media supplies and equipment shall be borne by the state and each participating district to the extent and in the manner provided in this subsection. . . .